This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

The
BYSTANDER
A
MONTHLY REVIEW
OF
CURRENT EVENTS
CANADIAN
&
GENERAL

Can 2.2

Harvard College Library

ADDED TO THE

PARKMAN COLLECTION OF
CANADIAN HISTORY

BY GIFT OF

CLARANCE MACDONALD WARNER

I. Korn Campbell

NOT PARTY, BUT THE PEOPLE.

A MONTHLY REVIEW

THE BYSTANDER

OF

CURRENT EVENTS,

CANADIAN AND GENERAL.

VOL I.

JANUARY TO DECEMBER,

1880.

Toronto:
HUNTER, ROSE AND COMPANY.
1880.

Can 2.2

Entered according to Act of Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty (for the Proprietor), by GRAEME MERCER ADAM, in the office of the Minister of Agriculture.

CONTENTS.

CANADIAN AFFAIRS:

	PAGE
Academy, The Canadian	86
Argyll (Duke of) Canard	581
Art Exhibition at Ottawa	178
Bank Stockholders, Position of	536
Banking and Currency	288
Bankruptcy Law, Repeal of the	290
Battle of the Parties, The	65
Bennett Case, The	413
Blake (Hon. Mr.) Return to Political Life	14
Blake, Resolution, The (Pacific R. R. Debate)	228
Blake (Hon. E.) and Mackenzie (Hon. A.) at the National Club	405
Blake (Hon. E.) and Sir John A. Macdonald	577
Bourinot (Mr. J. G.) and Hincks (Sir F.) on Canada	172
British Columbia, The Compact with	283
Budget, The Debate on the	225
Building Societies, The	180, 238
Bye Elections, The	487, 531
Canada, Grand Army of	462
—— Destiny of, Prinicipal Grant on	477
Canadian Academy, The	86
Cartwright (Sir R.) Speeches of	581
Changes in the Ministry	627
Civil Service Reform	59
Co-Education	591, 633
Collapse of Party Government in New Brunswick	294
Colonies, The	84
—— and Emigration	406
Commercial Union	298, 348, 474
—— The Press on	408
Commercial Policies, The Two	278
Commissions, Royal	476, 582
Compact with British Columbia, The	283
Continental and Anti-Continental Policies, The	341
Currency, National	68
—— Legislation	118
—— Increase of Paper	164
—— Fiat Money	171
—— Measure, The	236
—— and Banking	288
—— and the Government	356
Debate on the Budget, The	225
Deceased Wife's Sister, Marriage with	123
Destiny of Canada, Principal Grant on	477
Discussion, Freedom of	528
—— on Commercial Union	348
Drama, The, in Toronto	133
Educational Imbroglio, The	416
—— Reforms	128
Elections, Bye, The	487, 531
Exemption of Taxes Bill, The	130
Exodus, The, and the Financial Position	233
Exodus from New Brunswick	298
Federation, Imperial	121
Fiat Money	171
Financial Affairs	535
—— Statement, The	161
—— Position and the Exodus, The	233
Freedom of Discussion	528
Galt (Sir A. T.) Mission of	120, 287
—— Montreal speech of	170
—— and Emigration	346

	PAGE
Globe, New Management of..	293
——The, and the Senate..	350
Government, The, and the Currency.....	356
Governments and Liberty, Strong.....	472
Governments, Provincial, Encroachments of.....	586
Graduates, over-stocking of the market for.....	592
Grant (Principal) on the Destiny of Canada.....	477
Handford Case, The....296,	486
Hincks (Sir F.) and Bourinot (Mr. J. G.) on Canada....	172
Hum, The	626
Imperial Federation.....	121
Intercolonial Railway, The..	114
Interest, The Rate of.....	473
Journal of Commerce on THE BYSTANDER, The.....	628
Labour Riots, The.....	297
Leadership of the Opposition The.....123,	277
Liberty and Strong Governments.....	472
Lieutenant Governorship, The	125
Local Legislatures.....82,	124
Lucan Murders, The.....	132
Macdonald (Sir Jno. A.) and Mr. Blake	577
Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.....	123
Meeting of Parliament, The..	57
Militia, The.....	235
Montreal Movement, The...	75
——Commercial Union at	298
National Currency.....	68
—— Policy, The.....	5
—— Effects of the	352
——Club, Messrs. Blake and Mackenzie at..	405
New Brunswick, Exodus from	298
——Collapse of Party Government in..	294
New Opposition, The.....	460
New Quebec Loan, The.....	297
New Management of the *Globe*,	293
New Table of Precedence....	131
North-west Territory, The..	115
—— and its Prospects, The	285
—— and the Railway Policy.....	230
Ontario Legislature, The....	175
—— Bye Elections...487,	531
—— Parliament Buildings.....24,	177
Orangeism and its *Raison d'Etre*.....	411
Overstocking of the Market for Graduates.....	592
Opposition, The New.....	460
—— Press, The.....	578
Pacific Railway, The.....	226
—— Policy, Change in....	403
—— Negotiations, The....	459
—— Agreement, The..521,	573
Paper Currency, Increase of	164
Party and Partyism.....	2
——Government in New Brunswick.....	294
Parties, Battle of the.....	65
Partizan and Independent Journalism.....	359
Parliament and the Pacific R.R.....	621
Parliament Buildings, Ontario.....24,	177
Position of Bank Stockholders.....	536
Precedence, New Table of...	131
Press, The, on Commercial Union	508
Press, Opposition.....	578
Prince Edward Island Petition, The.....	235
Printing Contracts, The.....	235
Prohibition Movement, The.	357
—— and Religious Journalism..	483
Protection in Victoria.....	170
Provincial Governments, Encroachments of.....	586
Quebec Affairs..20, 238, 397, 364, 420,	593

PAGE

Quebec and New Brunswick Affairs..... 174
——— The New Loan 297
——— and the Maritime Provinces 539
Queen's University, Proceedings at..... 589
Railway Policy, The..... 113
Reciprocity 163
Reform of the Senate....60, 290
Religious Journalism and Prohibition..... 583
Repeal of the Bankruptcy Law..... 290
Royal Commissions.....476, 532

Secret Societies..... 537
Senate, Reform of the....60, 290
——— and the *Globe*, The.. 350
Stockholders, Bank, Position of..... 536

Tariff and the Revenue, The. 122
—— Amendments..... 162
Taxes Exemption Bill, The.. 130
Temperance Act, The..... 291
Toronto Custom House..... 117
Two Commercial Policies, The 278

University of Toronto Dinner, The 415
University Appointments, The 538, 588
——— Classical Professorship, The... 483
University of Queen's, Proceedings at..... 589
Universities and Education, The 331

Working Men's Manifesto, The..... 413

AMERICAN AFFAIRS :

PAGE.

American Parties, History of 423
——— Social Tendencies.. 491
——— Science Association Meeting..... 549
André Case, The..... 499
Annexation of Mexico..... 90

PAGE

Chances of the Presidential Contest..... 488
Chicago Convention, The, 298, 366

Defeat of the Third Term, The 367

Federal Constitutions..... 597
Female Suffrage..... 492
Faction Fight for the Presidency, The..... 134

Garfield (General) Character of..... 368
Grant (General) and the Presidency..... 26
Greenbackers, The..... 428

Maine Conspiracy, The...88, 428
—— Elections, The..... 547
Manning (Cardinal) on Politics 92
Mock Aristocracy, A..... 139
O'Conor's (Mr.) Letter..... 91

Parnell and the Irish Question..... 140
Presidency, The.....89, 134
——— Contest, The 239, 540, 594
Panama Canal, The..... 187

Revolt against "The Machine" The 300
Result of the Presidental Election, The..... 637
Republican and Democratic Nominees, The..... 422
Social War at San Francisco. 186
Somerset (Duke of) on Democracy..... 241
South, The, and Reconstruction..... 303

Tariff Retaliation..... 305
Third Term, The.....184, 337

Whittaker Case, The..... 305

EUROPEAN AND EASTERN AFFAIRS :

Afghanistan.....39, 97, 562
Amnesty Question in France, The 377

PAGE

Ascendancy of Gambetta, The 377

Bismarck and Socialism 654

Candahar Disaster, The..... 503

Designs of Bismarck, The... 329
Divorce Question in France, The..... 323
Dulcigno Affair, The 598, 650

Eastern Policy, The..... 33
——— Question, The..372, 440, 564
Effect of the English Elections 260
Europe, The State of.....31, 153

Female Suffrage in France... 263
France, The Crisis in..... 652
——— and Belgium..... 509
——— and Italy..... 105
French Anti-Jesuit Laws.... 261

Germany and the Jews, The. 444, 655

Italian Elections, The..... 330

Jesuits, Repression of the... 322
——— Expulsion of the.... 652

Ministerial Crisis in France The..... 652

Nihilism 606
Norway and Sweden..... 604

Russia, The Feud with 149

Sister Colonies, The..... 321
South African Confederation 440

Victoria, Protection in..... 170

Zululand..... 37

ENGLISH AFFAIRS:

PAGE.

Bradlaugh Case, The....319, 386, 433

Candahar, Disaster at..... 503

PAGE

Causes of the Conservative Defeat, The..... 373
Challomel-Lacour Affair, The 375
Claims of the Church of England, The..... 189
Coming Struggle in England, The..... 189
Conquest and Morality..... 151

Derby, Lord..... 152
Dissensions in the Liberal Party, The..... 375
Dulcigno Affair, The....598, 650

Eastern Question, The..... 440
Electoral Corruption..... 647
Election Trials..... 436
English Politics..... 95
——— Country Life..... 145

Female Suffrage in the Isle of Man..... 649
Foreign Policy..... 318
Fortune Bay Affair, The.... 320
Fortunes of the Battle, The.. 244

Game Laws, The.....433, 502
Gladstone (Mr.) as Premier.. 259
——— and Lord Beaconsfield 307
——— Illness of..... 502

Home Affairs..... 43
———Questions 253
House of Lords, Movement for Reform in the..... 554

Indian Budget, The..... 318
Ireland..... 101
——— Agrarianism in..... 642
Irish Disturbances..... 48
—— Question, The.431, 505, 558, 642
Land Question, The..... 143
Libel, Changes in the Law of 507
Liberal Programme, The.... 250
——— Victory, The..... 243

Misfortunes of the New Government..... 305

New Cabinet, The..... 305

PAGE

New Foreign Policy, The.... 251
New Phase of English Politics 500

Opening of Parliament, The.. 142

Pall Mall Gazette, The Change in the..... 316
Political Prospects in England..... 554
Premier and the Opposition, The..... 429
Probable Colonial Policy.... 258
Prospects of the Party Conflict..... 149
Protection in England..... 320
——— *versus* Free Trade. 436

THOUGHT AND OPINION:

Anglicanism and Protestantism..... 333

Back Streams of Opinion..... 662
Betting Mania, The 658

Cemetery Reform..... 610
Church and the Theatre, The 333
Claims of the Church of England, The..... 393
Copyright Question, The.... 518
Co-Education.....591, 633

Divorce Question in France, The..... 323
Education of the Clergy, The 515
Edward (Jonathan) and Mansel (Dean) 401

False Epitaphs 656
Farrar's (Canon) St. Paul... 110
Female Suffrage in France.. 263

H. M. S. Parliament..... 330

Ingersoll, Mr..... 225
——— Controversy..... 272
——— Defences of..... 567
Is Life Worth Living?..... 390

PAGE

Jews and Palestine..... 155

Materialism and Theism.... 335
Metternich Memoirs, The... 158
Morris (Hon. Mr.) on the Indian Treaties..... 452

National Games..... 454
New Reformation, The..... 615

Origin of the Laws of Nature 510

Physical Science in Hamlet.. 339
Prayer Question, The..... 337
Progress and Poverty..... 384
Progress of Thought in Morals The 673
Prosecutions for Blasphemy and Immorality..... 387

Rattray (Mr. W. J.) on the 'Scot in British North America'..... 269
Religion and Morality..... 158
Religious Journalism on Sara Bernhardt..... 660
Remusat (Mme. de) Memoirs of..... 212
Renan (M.) on Christianity.. 219
Robertson-Smith Case, The.. 514
Roman Pronunciation. 675
Ryerson (Dr.) on the U. E. Loyalists..... 446

Spencer's Ceremonial Institutions 395
Spencer's Data of Ethics.... 106
Stephen (Mr. Leslie) on Religion..... 338

Temperance *versus* Abstinence 620
Theism and Agnosticism.... 614
Todd (Mr. Alpheus) on Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies.... 263
Touring 378

U. E. Loyalism..... 446

THE BYSTANDER.

JANUARY, 1880.

EXPERIENCE has proved the difficulty of maintaining a Canadian Magazine in face of the competition to which it is exposed both from the side of England and from that of the United States. Our rivals are supported by an overwhelming amount of capital; our area of circulation is small, and it is cut in two by the French Province. But the same experience seems to show that there is a demand for a monthly survey of current events, Canadian and general, from a Canadian point of view. An English periodical cannot often deal with Colonial affairs, and, if it could, its reflections would call always for a supplement, and sometimes for an antidote. The political press of Europe is under the special influences of its own Continent; and among those influences at present are lassitude and disappointment, the legacies of revolution, and the cynical scepticism engendered in all spheres of thought and action by the rapid decay of religious belief. It is not well that the unwholesome dew of the European reaction should be distilled without correctives on the fresh character and unblighted hopes of a community of the New World.

On the other hand, Canadian affairs cannot be adequately treated by themselves. The influence of nations on each other is everyday being increased by mutual intelligence and sympathy, while the rapidity of international communication has made one audience of mankind.

Our point of view is Canadian, but outside the Canadian Parties. That such a position is at all events possible the most

thorough believer in party will hardly deny. Party, we know, has had and still has its uses. Party won for Canada the measure of self-government which she possesses. Without party the Great Charter could not have been extorted from a a tyrant; the House of Commons could not have been founded; the liberties of England could not have been rescued from the Stuarts; Parliament could not have been reformed in 1832. In the Mother Country a great struggle is still going on between aristocracy and democracy, and between their respective policies in Church and State, and the contending masses are divided by a real line: though even in the Mother Country there are symptoms of a decline of the system, and the attempt of Sir Robert Peel to rise above party and govern in the interest of the whole country carried with it the sympathy of the people, and was seconded by the best public men of that day. But what real line divides parties in this country? What are their principles but shadowy reminiscences of the state of things before Confederation, or even before the revolution of 1837? Not many years ago the leaders of both were members of the same Cabinet; and the old lines were drawn again not by any spontaneous movement of the people, but by personal enmity. At the last general election there was an important issue, but it was economical, not political; it was not raised by either of the parties, but pressed on both by an independent movement in the country; and the party which then leaped on the National Policy as the horse that would carry it back to power, had not ridden that steed before. Party, without a difference of principles, is faction; and what the fruits of faction have been in all countries, but especially in free countries, we know too well. All its evils are now plainly visible among us in the blade, if not in the full ear. Among other things, there is a most portentous growth of the class of camp-followers, who, instead of making their bread by honest industry, want to live upon the public. The applications for places since the change of Government are said to have amounted to thousands. What the political profession under-

the party system is in its lower grades, the conduct of wire-pullers who have obtained employment in the public service too often gives the community reason to know.

The idea that political party has a universal and perpetual basis in difference of temperament is absurd in itself, because no such sharp division of temperament exists; and it is belied by the whole history of faction, which shows that the bond commonly speaking is one not of temperament, but of interest or connection. A great movement, no doubt, attracts the young and sanguine, while it repels the cautious and the phlegmatic; but great movements are the exception. As a rule, where a State is divided into factions, you will find a mixture of temperaments, as well as of ages and sexes, on both sides; and on both sides you will find violence and roguery in the ascendant, and their ascendancy growing more complete the longer the reign of faction lasts. As a matter of course, each party proclaims, and, perhaps persuades itself, that its public morality is infinitely superior to that of its antagonist; but the onlooker sees that they are all of the same blood, brought up under the same influences, identical in their rules of private conduct; and that, in public life, they pursue precisely the same objects by the same means. The party in power is the more corrupt, only because it has in its hands the instruments of corruption; the party out of power boasts the purity to which an adverse fortune has for the time condemned it.

Politicians of the higher class among ourselves, while they pensively bow to party as a necessity, protest against its narrowness, its tyranny, its unreasonableness, its calumnious virulence. The necessity is imaginary; the protest is the voice of the future. Not division, mutual hatred, exclusion of half the citizens from the service of the country in the fancied interest of the other half, surrender of the political conscience into the hands of unscrupulous wire-pullers for the sake of organizing a party victory; but concord and co-operation for the common good, are the natural and normal state of a civilized nation. Out of government by faction we must in the

end find our way, if we wish to avoid political ruin. From it in the end we shall be delivered, partly through the teachings of dire experience and the reaction of the better mind of the community against the excesses of dishonesty and corruption; partly through the growth of intelligence, the advance of the scientific spirit, and the increasing strength of commercial interests, which faction always threatens with disaster. The leaders of our commerce already have shown a tendency to stand aloof from a game in which they and the industries represented by them can only be the losers, and on all occasions to cast an independent vote for the country.

For the present, however, the system exists. We must take it as it is, and adjust to it our judgments of public acts, and of public men, making allowance for its exigencies, unhappy as we may think them, yet without ceasing to look upwards to a better rule of action, and forwards to the hope of a national government.

In England, and in old countries in which the questions are the same that they are in England, it is impossible to be at once a Liberal and a Conservative. There, the Conservative is trying to uphold hereditary legislation, religious privilege, territorial primogeniture and clerical education, all of which a Liberal must regard as numbered with the past. But in such a community as ours, so far is there from being an essential contradiction between the two principles, that it is impossible to be a practical Conservative without being a genuine Liberal. If you aim at building up the edifice of a Conservative polity here, you must begin by frankly accepting as its foundation the great organic principles of society in the New World. Recognize Equality; put aside, once for all, the thought of class distinctions which, whatever they may be on their native soil, can only be disturbing and corrupting influences on ours. Educate the people, not only in the school, but through the press, and all the good influences of public life. Thus you may induce them to consent to the foundation of institutions destined to control passion, selfishness, and demagogic violence in the in-

terest, not of a privileged few, but of all. This is the genuine Conservatism of the New World; and the social order to which it tends is one really nobler, as well as far more securely founded, and more proof against revolutionary forces, than any which monarchy and aristocracy have produced in feudal Europe. Difficult to win no doubt is the prize before us; it will be great and enduring when it is won.

—The memorable part of the last general election was that the people on that day forsook in great numbers party allegiance to vote for their material interests, whether rightly or wrongly understood. The personal ascendancy of Sir John Macdonald did a great deal for his followers; but it was the National Policy that swept the country. Both the parties were taken by surprise: both hoped to win in the old way, by their wire-pulling, their political cries, and that never-failing spring of false hopes, the Roman Catholic alliance. But the result read a lesson which it is to be hoped some of our rising public men have ears to hear. It is probable that if another general election were held now the lesson would be read again, for the National Currency movement would certainly excercise an influence; some think it might even turn the scale; and it is at any rate a movement independent of political party, having for its object the material interests of the people. Upon the mind of the struggling farmer has dawned the great truth that the "principles" of political office-seekers are of very little consequence to him.

Of less significance, no doubt, yet worth noting, was the adoption of the name National for the policy which the country embraced. National is at all events the adjective corresponding to nation; and if the treason-axe can cut between the adjective and the substantive its edge must be very keen.

Does the new Tariff usher in a commercial millenium or the day of commercial doom? Seldom have good or bad effects so unlimited been ascribed to so limited a cause. All taxation

is an evil. Every increase of taxation is an evil. The increase of taxation embodied in the new tariff was in itself an evil. But there was a large deficit to be filled; new import duties were the only means of filling it, and in laying them on, the attempt was made to consider the industrial interests of our own country and especially to relieve our producers of the exceptional injustice to which in their relations with the producers of the United States, they were unquestionably exposed. The other party might have done precisely the same thing, without violating any economical principle. They had only to clear their mind of abstract names and phrases, by which no one who has studied political economy in its most recent developments allows himself any longer to be governed, to attend to the special grievance brought under their notice, and to adapt their legislation to the actual circumstances of the case. But, in deference to a formula, they chose to be stiff-necked; and they kicked complaining industry into the camp of their opponents. They avowed themselves with disastrous felicity "flies upon the wheel," and proclaimed, in effect, that in framing our tariff no thought ought to be taken of our special interests, but that we might just as well leave our policy to be regulated by our commercial rivals as regulate it ourselves.

People in England chide us as apostates from Free Trade. They are not Free Traders themselves. They repealed the Corn Laws which, by making bread dear to the workman, prevented the development of their manufactures, and their entire view of the subject has been naturally coloured by the success of that measure, from which they fancy they can derive a rule applicable to all countries and all cases. But they raise twenty millions sterling annually by customs. It is true that they have wisely adjusted their tariff to the circumstances of their own case; that they admit the raw materials of industry and the food of the workman free, while they lay taxes on such articles as wine, tea, coffee and tobacco; and they have only to concede the same liberty of adjustment to countries the circumstances of which differ from their own. All duties

interfere equally with freedom of trade; perhaps if we go to the bottom of the matter we shall find that all are equally protective of home products in general though not of those of the special kind. Cobden was a genuine Free Trader. The abolition of all customs duties was the object at which he aimed, and he used to say that the members of an English league formed with that object, were the only people who had real faith in the future of mankind. But while we have armaments we shall have customs duties; and while we have spirited foreign policies, we shall have armaments. The sentiments in the motto of the Cobden Club, "Free Trade, Peace, Good Will among nations," ought to be read in inverted order. We must have peace and good-will among nations before we can have free trade; and England, as an individual nation, is bound under the most tremendous penalties herself to set the example of peace and good-will. While her politicians and journalists are flinging about menaces on all sides, she will in vain call upon the nations, in the name of philanthropy and human brotherhood, to embrace the blessings of commercial union. She will in vain conjure them to secure to her the command of their markets in order to increase her wealth, if they are persuaded that in increasing her wealth they will be furnishing her with the sinews of aggression.

There are in England men both good and wise, who from having played an illustrious part in the repeal of the Corn Laws, and seen the happy effects of their work, are inclined to ascribe too boundless an efficacy to the beneficent influence of trade. They seem to think that if the commercial spirit could only be allowed free course, it would of itself keep the world right. But that spirit has wrought not a few acts of injustice and kindled not a few wars. Nothing will keep the world right but righteousness. Let righteousness prevail in the councils of England and a great step will have been gained towards the universal acceptance of Free Trade.

After all, what produced the deficit which these new duties

of ours were required to fill? What but Imperial aggrandizement? England chooses to have a railroad to carry her troops from Halifax to Quebec, and she chooses that another line should be run across the Continent to take in British Columbia, a province severed from Canada by the most adamantine barries of nature. The outlay on these objects causes our expenditure to exceed our revenue, and the additional taxes thus rendered necessary are imposed by English ambition on itself.

We shall soon see whether the new tariff will accomplish its direct object by bringing revenue to the level of expenditure. What will be the effect on industry it is too early to say. A revival of prosperity happily there is, but the good harvest here, the bad harvest in England, and the partial revival of the lumber trade are manifestly the cause. Sir Leonard Tilley has been very properly making a tour of commercial inspection. The Caliph Haroun Alraschid, when he wanted to know what was going on in Bagdad, made his tour of inspection in disguise. It is said that when the Empress Catherine visited the wilder parts of Russia, flattery contrived a movable village, which kept up with the imperial progress and satisfied the Empress of the beneficial results of her N. P.

In the city of Quebec it is to be feared no cheering prospect met Sir Leonard Tilley's eye. Beauty and romance remain, but Commerce has waved her wing and will hardly be lured back by tariffs to her ancient seat. For the last four or five years the shipping trade has been very low; silence has reigned along once busy quays, and the observer finds it difficult to understand how some classes of the community make their bread. Sir Leonard would find many of the manufactories and some of the machine shops closed. If, in certain trades, such as those of shoes and rubber, his eyes were gladdened by some signs of improvement, his ears were less agreeably saluted with cries for the reduction of duties. He received proof that Quebec could make good biscuits; but if the makers were not very prosperous, his exhortation to open a trade with the West Indies would sound rather like a knell. He must

also have been condemned to hear complaints of the increased price of tea, coffee, sugar, wearing apparel, and other articles of general consumption. The further east he goes the more he will be brought into contact with the special interests of the consumer, and the greater reason he will have for doubting whether the consumer is a hearty supporter of the N. P.

In discussing the new Tariff and all other fiscal questions, we subscribe, under protest, to the principle upon which the whole of our commercial policy is based. We assume that the commercial interest of Canada is capable of being separated from that of the continent of which she forms a part, and that it is possible and desirable permanently to treat the people on the other side of the line not only politically but commercially as a foreign nation. This is the creed of both the political parties, and those who dissent from it are denounced by both. We dissent from it, notwithstanding their denunciations, believing it to be at variance with the laws of nature. It is our conviction that Canada never can hope to enjoy her full measure of prosperity, devise what fiscal systems you will, till she is freely admitted to the markets of her own continent, till she is opened to the full inflow of its capital, till its commercial life runs unimpeded through her veins. As to a system of commercial isolation, whether it suits other countries or not, it assuredly will not suit her. Her climate is too severe and unvaried, her range of production is too limited, her markets are too contracted, her frontier is too long. The United States are not a country, they are a Continent, so vast in extent, and embracing such a variety of climate, soil and products, as to be almost an economical world in itself. Manufactures are now highly specialized, and without a large market they cannot succeed, while some are so costly and scientific that only a great and wealthy country can be their seat. Our new tariff increases the duty on high-class printing presses, which Canada can no more produce than she can produce tea. Moreover there is no privity of commercial interest between the different provinces of which the Confederation is composed. To

give the Maritime Provinces a stake in the tariff it was found necessary to impose a coal tax, which, to Ontario, is an unmixed evil, and is not unlikely to prove fatal to the whole arrangement.

A motion in favour of reciprocity, made by an individual member of Congress, has created the impression that the new tariff has brought the United States to their knees. We are convinced that this hope will prove unfounded. To a complete measure of reciprocity, such as would abolish the Customs line and constitute a commercial union, we believe the people of the United States are perfectly ready to accede. To a partial measure of reciprocity, such as has already been tried and has broken down, we believe that they are resolved not to accede. But the present experiment must be fairly tried. It is the logical outcome of the general principles of policy now established, embodied in a tariff framed evidently with care and in honest fulfilment of the election pledges of the Government. If it fails, the main question between Commercial Isolation and Commercial Union will present itself with renewed force, and any one who pretends to the name of a statesman will have to be prepared with a distinct answer.

It is scarcely credible that Sir Alexander Galt can be going to England to run his financial reputation on such a rock as an Imperial Customs' Union. How can a Customs Union be practicable without an identity both of commercial interests and of financial situation? These communities not only are scattered over the whole globe, but differ from each other as widely as possible in their productions, their commercial and industrial circumstances, and their financial requirements; New Zealand, for instance, having the largest public debt for its population in the world, while other colonies have scarcely any debt at all. Besides this, there would be difficulties of principle at the outset; Victoria being Protectionist, while New South Wales is Free Trade. What would Canada individually gain by any such arrangement? She would, of course, be called upon to repeal her tariff and to admit English manu-

factures free. This would be the very first condition of the agreement. On the other hand, is it conceivable that the English people would consent in the special interest of Canada to deprive themselves of American food, or even of Norwegian pine? What but altercations and misunderstandings could be expected to arise from such an attempt? The bond of nature which connects us with our Mother Country will remain unbroken for ever, if the politicians will abstain from entangling it with their artificial ties.

It was even announced by the London *Times* that Sir Alexander Galt had accepted the position of a member of the Canadian Cabinet resident in Downing street. Nobody who knew his character and career could for a moment believe the statement. He has been distinguished as a champion of Canadian self-government, and he understands constitutional principles far too well to sit as a Canadian Minister anywhere but in the councils and the Parliament of Canada. He is only to be an agent with a higher name. Still there may be need of watchfulness to prevent Canadian questions from being settled in the purlieus of Downing St., beyond the real control of the representatives of the Canadian people. The chiefs of our government have been drinking Imperialism at the fountain, and an Earldom of Ottawa may not be merely a contractor's dream. Here is an opportunity for the Opposition to do its duty, if it owns allegiance to the principles which tradition assigns to its peculiar care. No excess of nationalism need be apprehended, since there are knights upon both sides.

The day on which the representatives of the English farmers came to see Canada with their own eyes was a happy day in our annals. A fair report on our advantages by competent and truthful witnesses has long been one of our greatest needs. In the absence of it we have been welcoming with somewhat humble gratitude crumbs of ignorant praise thrown to us by any Englishman of rank, and puffs which we knew to be mendacious, and which as they came from official, if not from interested lips, the merest clodpole in England had too much discern-

ment to believe. The report of the farmers will be trusted, and apparently it is good.

Their testimony will convince the world that the North-West is a land of extraordinary promise, barring some special drawbacks—a climate which, though exhilarating, must require a heavy expenditure in clothes and fuel, late and early frosts, grasshoppers, and politicians. Had Nature been left to her course, instead of being cribbed and confined by charters and diplomatic lines, the region would have been opened long ago by spontaneous agencies, which would have cost Canada nothing, and would not have entailed the political dangers incident to the construction and ownership of railways on a large scale by the Government. The second consideration is one which we may expect to see presented to us again in lively colours before this great enterprise is completed, even though the members of the Government themselves may be entirely guiltless of corruption. We are somewhat duped by phrases in thinking of the North-West Territory as the heritage of Canadians. It is, economically at least, no more the heritage of the Canadian than of any one else who chooses to settle there—German, Swede, Icelander, Mennonite or American. If Canada is able to keep the trade of the North-West to herself and to compel it to buy everything it wants in her markets, she will be a commercial gainer by the connection. But it seems not very likely that the North-West, when it is out of leading strings, with a very mixed population, half composed of entire aliens to Canada, will continue to submit to this restriction; and in any other event what Ontario and Quebec will gain by any money they have laid out on this object will be what the Eastern States of America have gained by the opening up of the Great West—the loss of some of their best farmers, the reduction of the value of their farm produce, and the depreciation of their farms. If, in the coming years, the harvests in England and in Europe generally should be good, the production of wheat on this continent will be surely at least equal to the demand. It would be wicked to wish to

prevent, or delay for an hour, the opening up of new and rich territories because land in the old territories may lose its value. But there is no wickedness in wishing that the process could be left to the natural course of commercial enterprise, which adjusts and tempers everything, rather than accomplished by the stroke of a government in pursuit of political objects.

That political objects have been mainly, if not alone, in view, and that the commercial interests of the Canadian people have been almost, if not entirely, left out of sight, is a fact which becomes glaringly apparent when we turn our eyes to the British Columbian portion of the enterprise. Are there many men of business among us who do not regard the construction of this prodigious work for the purpose of opening a way to the ten or fifteen thousand white inhabitants of British Columbia commercially as an act of insanity? If the Pacific Union Railroad with difficulty pays its way, though its terminus is the haven and emporium of all the western waters, what is to be expected in the case of this line of ours, the terminus of which will be a village? When the fatal treaty was made there had been no proper survey, no line had been selected, no estimate of the cost had been formed. Political considerations ruled alone; of the material welfare of our people there was no thought. Yet the consequence of a commercial failure may be political disaster; it may be the forfeiture by Canada of her control over her own political destinies. This is what everybody says out of Parliament: in Parliament not a man has been found to stand up with resolution and vigour against this great folly and wrong.

British Columbia is not yet morally in the Confederation. She treats Canada as an adverse party whom she is trying to hold to the terms of a ruinous bargain. This being the case, it is unfortunate that the Prime Minister should have been forced by the untoward decision of Kingston to take his seat for a constituency in British Columbia. As a rule, it matters not for what constituency a Prime Minister sits; the safest and quietest is the best. Peel did quite right in sticking to

Tamworth, and Palmerston in sticking to Tiverton. But Sir John Macdonald's constituency is in the moon; not only is it in the moon, it is in the domain of the plaintiff in a suit for a prodigious sum in which we are the defendants. West Toronto will soon open her arms; let us hope not in vain.

—Art may restore the lost bloom to the cheek of beauty: no art can restore it to a peach or to a debutant. The interest that attached to Mr. Blake's appearance as an independent statesman six years ago can never be entirely revived. Still interest attaches to his second start. It is regarded as a victory of the more liberal and national element of a strangely compounded party over the other element, by which his reappearance is received in pensive silence. His election speech was a protest against party bondage. That the spirit in him is strong, we know; and we may hope that the flesh has become stronger. When Louis Napoleon, as a pretender, raised the standard of insurrection in the barrack yard at Strasbourg, the colonel rushed out and collared him; whereupon the aspirant to Empire immediately surrendered. The historian remarks that the appearance of the incensed colonel on the scene when his barrack yard was invaded was precisely the thing for which the Prince, if his enterprise was serious, ought to have been prepared. Mr. Blake has probably made up his mind, this time, to deal with the Colonel. Had he done so before; had he struck, however temperately and cautiously, one straight blow, he would have found that there was no very solid obstacle in his onward path. But at the decisive moment, it would appear, old political associates and timid advisers threw their arms around him. The column, at the head of which he had put himself, no sooner began to advance under fire, than it found itself deprived of its leaders, who had been cajoled or hustled into the enemy's lines. Political grapeshot kills nobody; and the column, by the use of proper rhetorical stimulants may be induced to advance again; but the untoward

record of the past will render more necessary a display of resolution for the future. People will not go tiger hunting if they think they are to be left to the tiger. Daring, in the auspicious hour, would have placed Mr. Blake at the head of the nation. The hearts of the people yearned towards him: they were sick of the stale and unprofitable politics of the old managers. The result of the course which he actually took is too well known; it is written on a disastrous and somewhat inglorious page of Canadian history. But the sun sets to rise again.

To think freely and see both sides of all questions is a mark of superior intellect which honourably distinguishes Mr. Blake from the factious narrowness or humble fidelity of some of his rivals. But it will not do to act upon divergent lines. One day Mr. Blake is overthrowing a tyranny; the next day he is setting it on its legs again. One day he is crowning, with his Supreme Court Bill, the edifice of Canadian self-government; the next he is advocating a resignation of our self-government to the Imperial Parliament under the name of Imperial Federation. Our representation, at Westminster, if proportioned to our numbers, would be nominal; our submission to the Imperial Legislature, and to the aristocracy which controls it, would be real and complete. Canada would be compelled, as the first consequence of that submission, to conform to an Imperial Tariff, framed in the interest of the British producer. As its next consequence, she would be saddled with the responsibility and the burden of the foreign policy of the Empire, compelled to send her contingent to the army and fleet, and to bear her share of the military taxation. And thus, not only would she be involved in heavy expenditure for objects in which her people have no interest, such as the subjugation of the Zulus and Afghans, the suppression of liberties struggling under the Turkish yoke, the prosecution of opium wars against China; but she would be in danger of being drawn into what many of us would deem a career of crime. The British aristocracy, as a political institution, is now the last

leaf on the tree; all its fellows have been swept away by the storm of European Revolution; feeling its peril, it obeys the instinct of self-preservation, and tries, not without success, to launch the nation into a course of military aggrandizement, the best antidote, as experience has proved, to political progress. Whatever guilt conquest might involve, whatever enmities and jealousies it might entail, we should share without profit and without excuse. Mr. Blake thinks that the representative of Canada would have voted against the Zulu war: suppose he had, he would have been voted down; his protest would have gone for nothing, and the hand of his country would have been set to the mandate of iniquity. But has Mr. Blake observed the influence of Downing Street and London society on the sentiment of the domesticated colonist? If he has, does he feel no misgivings as to the course which his Canadian representative would have pursued? The practicability of the scheme has been debated to the dregs. Of course it is practicable in a certain sense to form a Confederation of Canada, Tahiti, the Greek Church, and the Freemasons. But such an association could have no common object, and therefore no natural ground of existence, no bond to hold it together. Public men, perhaps, sometimes dally with Imperial Federation as a tribute to political orthodoxy when they have another thing in their minds. But they had better not commit themselves too far, or they will hardly be able to retreat without disgrace.

The largest space in Mr. Blake's programme is filled by the changes which he proposes in the machinery of elections. The Minorities' Clause is a taking plan; but it has been fairly tried in England, and the result where it has taken effect has been a standing compromise based on the relative number of parties at the time of its introduction, which the members on both sides have the strongest personal interest in upholding, but which destroys political life. Another bad consequence is that the minority member is nailed to his seat and disabled from retiring on the ground of infirmity, or taking office, because his seat, if vacated, would be lost. In cities like Glasgow, Bir-

mingham and Manchester, where political life is superabundant, the operation of the clause has been defeated, wholly or in part, by machinery which, like all complex arrangements, harbours wirepulling and diminishes instead of increasing the electors' liberty of choice. What the specific object of compulsory voting is, we must profess ourselves at a loss to say. It could hardly prevent bribery, because the elector, though compelled to vote for one candidate or the other, would still have the power of selling his vote to either. Those who will not take the trouble to vote, have generally not thought about the matter; and those who have not thought about the matter are surely best at home. The contrivers of the machinery no doubt understand its working, which to our apprehension presents some difficulties, especially in connection with the party system. Apparently in case of the most frivolous and vexatious opposition, say to the re-election of a member who had taken office, the constituency would be compelled to turn out to a man, perhaps in the middle of winter, and in a storm, on pain of forfeiting the franchise; and sweeping disfranchisements would very likely be the result. If these questions were at present in season, there is a change which we should prefer to either of the two proposed by Mr. Blake. The grand evil of our system of representation is that the nominations have been engrossed by wirepullers, so that freedom of election has been practically lost. The ultimate source of this evil is faction, and the only effectual remedy is national government. But experience seems to show that the right of the people might be in some measure restored by the requirement of an absolute majority, and in default of it, of a second ballot between the two candidates highest on the poll, all the others being thrown off. Under this system an independent candidate is able to meet the standing argument of the wirepullers by saying to the electors, 'vote for me in the first instance: if I fail, your vote will not be lost; you will have the opportunity of falling back on your party candidate at the second ballot.' It may be said that the snare is vainly set in sight of the bird, and that a Bill

for the repression of wirepulling will never be passed by a Parliament of wirepullers. But, at this moment, inventing new electoral machinery is turning aside from the field of action to spin tops. Our commercial relations and the railway to British Columbia are the subjects now before the country. The man who has not made up his mind upon these points, or is not prepared to act on his decision with vigour, can be no more than an interesting figure on the political scene. In declaring for a reform of the Senate, Mr. Blake touched on a more practical theme, though he propounded no definite plan. A loosening of tongues among the leaders of the opposition on this subject is a salutary and redeeming consequence of their defeat under the banner of obstruction. But their position is a weak one. To confess that you have allowed the whiff of a newspaper to scare you out of such a measure as the reform of a branch of the Legislature scarcely beseems the dignity of men who aspire to lead a nation; yet it is better than saying that you want to change the Senate because of late it has not been on your side. To put a check on the action of the dominant party in the House of Commons was the very object of the institution. The reform is coming. The Senators themselves, even the most Conservative of them, must see the necessity, though they may deplore it. But the Ministers have the advantage in moral position as well as in numbers; and they will be wanting to their own fortunes if they fail to take up the question and settle it themselves, instead of leaving it to be settled by the Opposition.

In the speech to which we have been referring, Mr. Blake once more reverted to the Pacific Railway Scandal. But his feeling being genuine, not hypocritical, was temperately expressed, and he did not apply to Sir John Macdonald the overpainted passage of Macaulay, describing the perfect union of all evil qualities in the diabolical character of Barére. Nor, if the truth must be told, was his mention of the subject needless. Sir John Macdonald unfortunately persists in holding very equivocal and disquieting language on the subject. Between

receiving an ordinary subscription to an election fund and receiving money from the applicant for a railway charter there is, we must say, no analogy whatever. The use of a political club as the receiver on such occasions would only make the matter worse, since, instead of a single corrupt act, there would be a standing machinery of corruption. Of the two great political clubs in England, the Reform has no election fund; and if the Carlton has one, it certainly is not made up by contributions extracted from applicants for railway charters. But let the Carlton do what it thinks fit: we do not want to import into this country the corrupt agencies by which the aristocracy in England carries on its political war against the people. If the United Empire Club were once safely placed on a social basis, as Conservative and as Imperial as it pleases, relief would be felt by many who sincerely desire that the fame of Sir John Macdonald should grow brighter, and not darker, toward the close. The Pacific Railway Scandal is a thing not to be defended but to be effaced, above all by widening the basis of government and tempering, as a minister with a great majority may, the bitterness of the party conflict from which all these calamities flow. The subject is not a pleasant one; but there is still danger of corruption: there is danger in connnection with the tariff, there is danger, and imminent danger, in connection with the railway contracts. The country cannot afford to have any misunderstanding as to the rules of honour which bind our public men.

Who are to be the leaders of the Opposition will presently appear. The signs in the Press are favourable to the Liberals, whose organs gain circulation, while those of the Grits lose it. Who is to be the next Prime Minister of Canada will probably not appear for some years to come. The Government has the wind of prosperity full in its sail: unless it scuttles itself with a scandal, it may be expected to continue its course till its railway expenditure runs it into financial difficulties, which may perhaps be aggravated by harvests less good than the last; and when that crisis comes, there will be a general demand for a leader wholly devoted to the material interests of the country.

—The Comedy of *Coups d'Etat* in Quebec has apparently been closed by the secure installation of a Coalition Government and the tranquil division of power and patronage, though the latter is always a matter of secondary consideration in that Province. Here we have another proof of the inanity of party divisions in the case of the Local Legislatures. Men who yesterday fancied themselves severed by an impassable gulf of principle to-day are in each other's arms. The verdict of history, if she deigns to notice our doings, upon this episode, can hardly be doubtful. The dismissal of the De Boucherville Ministry was a party move, and the quarter whence the fatal inspiration came is apparently betrayed by farcical anguish. The fact, stated in Sir John Macdonald's memorandum. that the bargain between Mr. Joly and Mr. Turcotte respecting the Speakership was struck in the presence of Lieut.-Governor Letellier seems decisive as to the character of the transaction. On the other hand the Senate clearly broke the Constitution in stopping the Supplies, which, according to constitutional principle, ought only to be done when a Ministry condemned by Parliament refuses to retire. Lieut.-Governor Robitaille followed an established and most necessary rule in declining to allow Mr. Joly to appeal to the country against a Parliament of his own calling. The dispute between the Houses had been settled, and no longer afforded ground for a dissolution: otherwise, in this case, as in that of the conflict between the Lords and Commons in England respecting the Reform Bill of 1831, the proper course would have been a reference to the tribunal of the people. As to the action of the Dominion authorities, the Prime Minister himself pretty evidently felt that a verdict once delivered by the Dominion House of Commons and the constituencies of Quebec on the Letellier case, whether right or wrong, ought to be allowed to stand; but he could neither convince nor shoot his French followers; and while the system of party lasts, the tail will sometimes move the head. The Governor General naturally demurred, the question being new, the authority of the Crown

being involved, and the alleged ground of dismissal having occurred under his predecessor. The obvious mode of avoiding a collision was a reference to the Home Government, which is at all events the guardian of the British North America Act. The terms in which the adoption of this course was announced to Parliament have formed the pretext for reviling the Prime Minister in language applicable only to convicted felons; but it turns out, as might have been expected, that they had been previously arranged with the Governor General. The Opposition, of course, would have liked a dissolution, which would have given it a chance, and, as public feeling then was, a very good chance, of winning back some seats: but the Government is not bound to provide catastrophes for the benefit of the Opposition. Such, we presume to predict, will be the judgment generally pronounced when the time for a calm review arrives.

This Quebec embroglio is not likely to be the last of the kind. Among the orators of Confederation there was one, and one only, who attempted, in a statesmanlike manner, to forecast the working of the projected institutions. Mr. Dunkin clearly foretold the difficulty of carrying on this complex system, and the conflict which there would be between the powers and parties of the Dominion and those of the several Provinces. The struggle in Quebec evidently has been, at bottom, an attempt of each of the Dominion parties in turn to extend its sway over the Provincial Government and patronage, which, by the theory of Confederation, were to be entirely independent of central influence. Nor are things different in Ontario, where a Dominion party, though that which happens at present to be in the minority at Ottawa, has grasped the Government, having turned out Sandfield Macdonald manifestly on account of his connection with the Tories. A Dominion party has, in fact, been guilty in Ontario of an excess more dangerous than the two violations of constitutional principle in Quebec. We refer to the assumption by the Legislature of another session, when the regular term of its

existence had morally, and, perhaps, legally expired—a proceeding manifestly dictated by the hope that a delay of the elections would give a vantage ground to the Grits on a question of Dominion politics. The resources of constitutional learning have been somewhat superfluously expended in proving that legislatures do not sit till their numbers are complete. It is one thing, we submit, to wait till all your members have come in: it is, morally at least, another thing, when you have reached the end of your term, to devise a technical quibble, founded on an unconstitutional act of your own respecting the date of an exceptional election, for the purpose of prolonging your trust beyond the period for which you have received it from the people. The usurpation is crowned by the assertion that the Local Legislature has given legality to its own act. That the Local Legislatures are not sovereign powers, but assemblies holding limited authority under an Act of the Imperial Parliament, and become nullities when they step beyond the limit, will speedily appear if the validity of any Act of the last session in Ontario should ever be brought before a court of law.

In another way these occurrences in Quebec are instructive. Rueful experience is gradually teaching the enthusiastic nations that the political clothes of England will not fit all the world. It has been assumed on all hands that the British Constitution is something at once perfectly well-defined, capable of exportation to any country, and not less universally salutary than Morrison's British pills. In fact, it is made up of elements all more or less essentially English and incommunicable to other nations; to wit, three feudal powers, the Crown, the Lords, and the Commons, of which the last has nearly swallowed the other three, though their tails still protrude from its mouth; the Great Charter with its supplement the statute against Tallage, the Petition of Right, the Bill of Rights, and the Habeas Corpus Act, which form the muniments of English liberty; and a body of unwritten traditions and understandings respecting the conduct of Parliamentary government and the laws of the party game. To the last category belongs the vital rule that

the Crown must call to its councils the leaders of the majority, as well as those to which we have just referred, against appealing to the country from a Parliament of your own calling, or refusing supplies before you have carried a vote of non-confidence. This unwritten portion of the Constitution, even in England, is hardly settled: a recent historian lauds the reign of Victoria as the beginning of really constitutional government. But in England the traditions and understandings are on their native soil; everybody knows them, everybody has been trained to keep them; general opinion enforces them; while they are in the special guardianship of a group of political families, which have long shared among them the offices of state, and are bound, under the heaviest penalties, not to ruin their own perquisites. But with us, constitutional tradition is comparatively faint; in the French Province it hardly exists: the unwritten law is neither distinctly understood by the masses nor irresistibly enforced by public sentiment. Our politicians, taken to-day from the crowd, and to-morrow returning to the crowd from which they were taken, are imbued with no hereditary respect for restraints imposed by tacit compacts. We must expect them, in the heat of the struggle, to use their full legal powers, as they have done in Quebec; and if they use their full legal powers, there is an end of our British Constitution.

We have Constitutional writers no doubt to teach us: but unfortunately on both sides of the water they are unwilling to see the cardinal fact that the House of Commons has asserted its ascendancy over its quondam superiors, and that it really appoints the Government. Hence their works are full of solemn and orthodox figments, which in practice can only delude. One of them tells us that the British Party Cabinet is a Committee of the Privy Council. It is a Committee of the Privy Council just in the same sense as a shark is a committee of the negro whom he swallows.

Let old countries govern themselves, if they can, by feudal tradition and antiquarian sentiment, upholding unwritten un-

derstandings. For us there will be no security but in written regulations, intelligible to the people, clearly defining every function, and limiting every power. For us, the only safe basis of government is the reverence of an educated people for wise, just, and certain law.

—When a million has been spent on an august habitation for the Local Legislature of Ontario, we shall be more firmly saddled than ever with the system of double government. This country, encased in its intricate and expensive apparatus of Constitutional Monarchies, and Parliaments, Central and Provincial, is like the fabled Dutchman in his dozen pairs of nether garments. If one assembly is enough to make laws for thirty millions in England, or forty millions in France, why do our four millions require eight? Old countries, such as England and France, might be able to supply duly qualified legislators for eight assemblies: a country in the stage of development in which Canada is can barely supply them for one. The whole of our civil legislation, even on the most momentous subjects, must inevitably be consigned under the present arrangement to hands, properly fitted only for the management of local affairs. Considering what might happen, we may, perhaps, deem it fortunate that the Local Legislators spend so much of their time in playing at party, and debating the Canoe Couch or the Proton Outrage. The whole of the work done by the Parliament of Ontario, in its last session, might have been much more expeditiously done by a good practical council of Reeves. By the National Parliament, again, a great deal of time is wasted in wrangling, partly because more than half of the legislative business of the nation has been taken out of its jurisdiction, while it has, properly speaking, no Federal functions, being the Parliament of a dependency, the foreign policy of which is reserved to the Imperial government. The jealousy of Quebec concerning its separate Code is the only justification for a system which, upon its general merits, hardly

anybody defends. But why could not the National Legislature of Canada respect the separate Code of Quebec as the British Parliament respects the separate Code of Scotland? However there is little use in talking: the system is now rooted in vested interests; and we shall have a chance of seeing the end of it only when the growing burden of expenditure forces the country to stop the waste.

It is not likely that we shall find government less expensive in the future. Though Canada is young in years, she begins socially to feel the liabilities and to be confronted by the problems of old and crowded countries. Pauperism has shown its ghastly face, and raised the question, as difficult as it is unwelcome, of a permanent provision for the poor. Callings are overcrowded, and an advertisement for twelve teachers in a High School brings three hundred applications. The *Mail* has won renown by a searching exposure of the haunts of vice in Toronto. That cancer, too, has appeared, and is not to be cut out by the knife of penal law: it is in the constitution: and the darker the dens into which you drive the evil, the worse probably it will be. Very little would be gained by substituting abortion for prostitution. The source of the malady is inability to marry, which again arises from the difficulty of finding a livelihood among the men, and the destitution which thrusts women into a horrible and hideous trade. There is no cure but a policy which will promote the national welfare of the people; and to this, when the freaks of ambition are exhausted, the holders of power will perhaps turn. But that day is yet distant. Go to the low quarters of London, to those cities of the wretched where misery, if it is not more intense, is more squalid and hideous in its aspect than any where else in the world,—go to them at night, when the gin palace flares, and vice as well as famine is abroad; or go to the hovel where the British agricultural labourer is maintaining himself, his wife and six children, on three dollars a week, and trace him thence to the penal workhouse, his inevitable receptacle if he has the misfortune to reach old age; then reflect that these people are being taxed for

the destruction of Afghan villages and the extermination of Zulus. Not only so, but such of them in the cities as have votes are generally brought to the poll by beer and other Tory agencies to vote for a spirited foreign policy, and the extension of 'their' Empire.

—The makers of easy philosophy have again proclaimed that the great peril of the United States is the Irish element, which, we are told, is a mass of political crudity too great for the digestive powers of the Republic. It is not wonderful that a race which, through long centuries, had known government only as its enemy, and law only as the cunning engine of its oppressor, should require a protracted novitiate in order to adapt it to Republican institutions, though, as a set-off against his political failings, the Irishman has built the cities and railroads of the United States. But there is a greater peril than the Irish element, or even the foreign element generally, as the best citizens begin already to see. It is Faction, which, unless it can be arrested in its fell career, will soon threaten the very life of the Republic. And that which chiefly lends malignant energy to Faction is the elective Presidency, which, with its enormous patronage, forms the prize of a perpetual strife between two armies of office-seekers, ever growing more numerous, more hungry, and more unscrupulous, while, by means of their unconstitutional organizations, the national representation is becoming irretrievably vested in their usurping hands. Once in every four years every public question is brought by these intriguers to a dangerous head; but the process of irritation, corruption, and demoralization is never suspended; all local elections and interests are swept into the vortex; everything is tainted by the practices and sacrificed to the objects of the general game. Slavery itself might possibly have died a quiet death, if a Presidential election had not brought the question to a violent crisis, which, combined with the treachery of the arch-wirepuller whom

party had placed in the Presidential chair, plunged the nation into civil war. The dispute between Hayes and Tilden, three years ago, brought the country again to the brink of confusion; and though the immediate danger was surmounted by the almost inexhaustible good sense of the people, a severe shock was given to the integrity of the suffrage, the sole source of legal authority, and the sole foundation of Republican Government. In Maine, and elsewhere, a decided tendency has since been shown to set aside the legitimate verdict of the polls by the abuse of administrative power. A few more steps in that direction and the faction-fight will become anarchy. No reflecting man can look forward without the most serious misgivings to the possibility of another disputed election, with political passion at fever-height, and after mutual outrages which, to infuriated partizans on both sides, will seem to legitimize the use of violence and fraud.

Next to faction, the greatest peril is the solid South. The South, as it does not expand, is rapidly becoming a mere fraction of the Union; but in the meantime it forms the nucleus of a vast confederacy of mischief, including disturbers of the currency, as well as political marauders of all kinds. The expectation that the white element would split into parties has been belied. The whites are held together by their paramount interest as a dominant race in presence of an inferior one backed by support from without. Yet commercial influences working from New Orleans, might gradually induce a change of temper and restore the South to the Union, were it not for the action, in this quarter also, of the universal bane. No healing process can go on while the Southern States are kept politically under arms for a coming Presidential Election. Had they at the close of the civil war been restored to internal self-government, but excluded for a time from participation in Federal elections, and Federal politics generally, it would have been far better for them as well as for the Union. Among the Southerners themselves there is now on foot a movement in favour of secession from Presidential contests, which is highly significant, though it will no doubt prove abortive.

Commercial prosperity was rapidly reviving, and the finances were in the best train when Congress met. For some months to come the country, with all its great interests will be quaking and quivering in the hands of political gamesters, sent to Washington by the wirepullers, not by the people, who will recklessly sacrifice everything to the objects of their game. Trade will be disturbed, wages lowered, and the bread taken out of the mouths of the people by the tampering of demagogues with the currency. Public money will be thrown away for party purposes, as last session twenty-five millions were thrown away under the pretext of a Pension Arrears Bill, to buy the soldiers' vote. This is not self-government, it is government by Faction; and that government by Faction will in the end ruin self-government is the lesson which all free communities, if they would save themselves from anarchy, must learn.

A gallant and hopeful effort to loosen the party-yoke was made the other day in the State of New York, where the Reform wing of the Republican party scratched Mr. Cornell, the Anti-reform nominee of the Machine for the governorship. Mr. Cornell ran far behind his ticket, and was saved from defeat by an alliance with Tammany, as frail as it is unlovely. The urgent need of emancipation was signalized by the abasement of two members of President Hayes' Cabinet, who were actually compelled by the Machine to take the stump in support of a nomination, avowedly directed against the Reform principles on which the administration is founded, and which the President in his message still affects to uphold. In a very different way the relaxation of the party bond is indicated by the large vote polled in Massachusetts by General Butler, whose supporters were at all events seceders from both the regular parties, preferring local objects, and measures of material relief, real or fancied, for the struggling farmer and artisan, to the issues framed for them by the Federal politicians.

Everything points at present to General Grant as the next President. It is a conclusion to which the best citizens resign

themselves with sadness, because they know too well that General Grant will bring back with him the men who, for eight years, carried on a government of corruption and intrigue, established at the South a domination of scoundrels, as ruinous in every sense as it was shameful, wasted the immense heritage of Republican victory, and tore half the laurels from the victorious general's brow. But Grant, who is, after all, the hero of the war, can carry the whole Republican vote, especially in the indispensable State of New York, so that his nomination affords the best chance of escaping that unspeakable peril—a disputed election. Even at the South the recollection of his generosity as a soldier has not been entirely effaced by his evil policy as a ruler. His firmness in case of need can be thoroughly trusted, and though surrounded by corrupt men, he has never been himself convicted of corruption. His name excites suspicion of dynasticism and military rule, for which the conduct of some of his sycophants has furnished too much ground. But there has been no reason for believing that, in the heart of the General himself, disloyal ambition has ever found a place. There is nothing in him of the conspirator; nor does he appear ever to have lost the simplicity of character and dislike of military display which invariably marked his bearing at the head of the armies of the Republic. We remember his quarters on the James, in no way distinguished from those of a regimental officer, with the rough military chest in which all his belongings were contained. His re-election would probably end in his Presidency for life, the good part of which would be the respite which it would afford from factious strife, while the bad part would be the indefinite retention in office of his highly undesirable friends. Perhaps the evil might be tempered by the growth in Congress of an honest and independent opposition in the interest, not of a party, but of the country.

In spite of his tour, General Grant has probably remained a good American; he passed through the series of Old World influences too rapidly to catch the infection; and he might be

relied on for patriotism in dealing with external relations. Washington's advice was wise, but the American Republic is on this planet; if she takes no interest in the affairs of other countries, other countries, or certain classes in them, take a deep interest in hers. General Grant remembers the time when the Southern Club was sustaining the Rebellion, and Imperialism was at work in Mexico; while his visit to the East may have impressed on him the fact that European cupidity is rapidly making its way towards the seats of American commerce in China and Japan. Of his pursuing an aggressive policy against the neighbours of the Republic there is happily no danger. That spirit was cast out with slavery.

The break-up of the Oneida Community—for a break-up the abandonment of its peculiar domestic system will surely prove—marks the approaching end of that curious group of socialistic and communistic experiments in living, about which many books have been written. Most of the experiments, including those made by the great Socialist Owen, have been total failures. Success, where any measure of it has been attained, will be found, by a careful induction, to have depended on two things, religious enthusiasm and abstinence from marriage. Religious enthusiasm has preserved unity, in some cases under the form of a religious dictatorship, such as that of Mr. Noyes at Oneida; abstinence from marriage has at once rendered life in common possible, and led to the accumulation of wealth, which children would have consumed. In the Oneida Community there was a horrible system of regulated concubinage, which was styled complex marriage; but offspring was narrowly restricted, at least till the community had grown rich. Moreover, all these experiments have been on too small a scale to warrant inferences with regard to society at large. Their feeble lamps will go out without shedding any light on the mighty social problems with which the coming generations will apparently have to deal.

—The state of Europe may be described as a reign of military ambition tempered by deficits and modified by the *Almanach de Gotha*. The hands of the great powers would very likely be at each other's throats if they were not held back by finance; while family ties between the Emperors, especially between the German Emperor and the Czar, cross and perplex the political game. In the meantime, as a consequence of their military taxation and conscription, the whole group are being threatened by an enemy from within, in the form of a socialistic movement, the manifest offspring of misery among the masses, which gathers strength and is apparently destined to be the great fact and the great peril of the future. That this movement has its immediate source in special grievances, is plain from its coincidence in range with the pressure of the military system. But supposing that the special grievances could now be removed by the disarmament for which even Bismarck sighs, or affects to sigh, it by no means follows that Socialism would cease to exist. In the case of the French Revolution, the immediate source of disturbance was bankruptcy. The French Monarchy had been bankrupt before; but now the fountains of the social deep were broken up and a torrent set flowing which no fiscal measures could have stayed. It will be noted that the present movement, both in Germany and Russia, has not only an economical but a philosophic and theological, or rather anti-theological character. Religion hitherto has induced the less fortunate classes to acquiesce humbly in poverty and suffering here by holding out to them the promise of compensation in another world. But religion has been losing its hold: scepticism spreads rapidly among the masses in Europe; they are casting off theological hopes and fears; they demand that their lot shall be made just and materially happy here; they assail the whole social and political structure which has had religious belief for its basis; they question the justice and beneficence not only of earthly governments but of the higher power which earthly governments have hitherto been believed to represent.. While Germany was in the springtide

of hope, pushing forward to her national unity, and fancying that it would be the dawn of a new era, Arthur Schopenhauer preached Pessimism without a disciple; now his disciples form no small portion of thinking Germany; and his doctrine, assuming, as all revolutionary doctrines do, a more extravagant form and a darker hue in the mind of the fantastic and unbalanced Slav, becomes Russian Nihilism, and wages satanic war against all existing institutions, political, social, domestic and ecclesiastical, with the weapons of the assassin. In one way or other, by general disarmament or by mutual destruction on a vast scale, the present military system of Europe must come to an end: but it is not so certain that European society will settle down again into its former state. The governing classes of old countries, at all events, have work enough cut out for them in the coming years.

To no one is a larger meed of sympathy and pity due than to a reformer assailed by the dagger of revolution. The Emperor Alexander has been more than a reformer—he has been a reformer on a throne; and his principal reform was the most extensive, the most difficult, and the most perilous ever accomplished by a single legislative stroke. That the emancipation of the Serfs was merely the selfish policy of a despot who wished to depress a powerful aristocracy, is an aristocratic calumny: it was accompanied by other measures of improvement, political and judicial, which abundantly attested the liberal aims of its author. In the opinion of those who know Russia best, Alexander's legislation, as a whole, went at least as far as, with a nation wholly untrained to self-government, it was safe to go; and sharp must be the sting of revolutionary ingratitude. Pius the Ninth, when the movement which he had helped to launch got beyond his control, apostatized from Liberalism and became the high priest of Reaction. If Alexander remains true to Reform he will be a hero. As we write there come renewed rumours of his abdication. Assuredly he has all the reasons for such a step which were ever gathered within the uneasy circlet of a crown.

Not that Nihilism in Russia appears yet to have assumed anything like the proportions of Socialism in Germany. The secrecy which the conspirators have been able to preserve would in itself lead us to surmise that their number must be small, while the visionary character of their creed points to an intellectual, and therefore a limited class. It is probable that the mass of the people of all orders are still faithful to the Czar, and would be satisfied, at any rate, by a constitutional reform of a kind suited to the present stage of national development. No rational Liberal would think of introducing representative government, with the plenitude of popular control over the executive, the finance, and the army, among a people of whom only a fraction can read and write. The assembly of notables which was projected before the last attempt on the Czar's life seems as wise and safe a measure as could be proposed.

The Eastern Question is still the central vortex round which the political maelstrom whirls. Had England thought fit to take a straightforward course at the Conference of Constantinople, and in conjunction with the other Powers, to press upon the Porte the reform of its government in Bulgaria, it is certain that the Turk must have yielded, and it is not less certain that the Czar, weary, care-laden, and utterly disinclined to war, would have accepted and compelled his servants to accept a solution which would have satisfied his reasonable sympathies and saved his honour. Islam, in Europe, would have taken, with Oriental resignation, one more step in the inevitable descent, and all this bloodshed, this devastation, this outbreak of deadly passions, this throng of perils casting their shadows far into the future, might have been averted from mankind. Diplomacy, if it is the art of settling difficulties without war, might have claimed a genuine triumph. But then there would have been nothing for the Music Halls, nothing to awaken the Jingo lyre, nothing out of which to weave the wreath of Tracy Turnerelli. So the English government took its stand on the integrity and independence of the Turk-

ish Empire, and on the perfect ability and willingness of the Turk to reform himself without foreign intervention. Encouraged by the authentic voice of the British Cabinet, which she easily distinguished from the formal utterances of its representative at the Conference, Turkey resisted, and after hideous carnage was laid prostrate, as everybody who knew anything of her state foresaw. Then her faithful and disinterested friend rushed to her rescue, asserted her outraged integrity by dismembering her of Cyprus, and preserved her threatened independence by taking her Asiatic dominions under a protectorate which is fast being turned into a dominion on the plea of carrying out for her the reforms which she is herself unable or unwilling to carry out. Such a plea was not likely to be wanting. It has been said that there are many abuses in Turkey; but in truth there is only one—the existence of the Turks as a dominant race, with an intolerant religion. The reform of such a race means its abdication; and the Turk has sense to see that before presenting his neck to the bowstring he may as well try to set his reformers by the ears. In that department of diplomacy he is a Talleyrand, as the angry and anxious movements of the British Ambassador show.

When the Jingo lyre is mute, sober inquirers will ask what has been gained by this policy which would not have been gained by one less costly to England, to Europe, and mankind. Russia has got what, had the Conference of Constantinople succeeded, she would not have got—Armenia, Bessarabia, and Christian nationalities on the road to Constantinople, emancipated by her intervention, and looking to her as their patroness. England has drawn upon herself the deadly hatred of Russia, her firmest friend in the war with Napoleon, and afterwards, till Napoleon's heir, for his own dynastic purposes, brought about the Crimean War. In this the Music Halls exult. But does any reasonable man? With Russia single-handed, England is able to deal; though the truth is that no living Englishman knows what war would be with an enemy able to put even a dozen cruisers on the sea. But if

Russia could find a single ally among the powers of Europe, the case of the empress of India would be desperate; and therefore in the councils of Europe the voice of England will henceforth be weak. It is not unlikely that France, finding the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine hopeless, may seek to indemnify herself by annexing Belgium; and if she does, England can offer no resistance; nor can she offer any resistance if Germany should ever deem it her interest to force Denmark into the Bund. When the Fisheries question comes round, the Americans, in any demands they may make, will feel that they have Russia behind them; and England will fear to provoke the enmity of two nations capable, on a short notice, of becoming formidable to her trade. That such a power as Russia can be prevented for ever from making its way to an open sea, is surely a Jingo dream.

When the Czar withdrew his army from Constantinople, it seemed to be assumed that Russia was extinguished, and that nothing remained to be done but to play The Conquering Hero and turn all the tinfoil into crowns. Yet there she stands, with her eighty millions of people, victorious in her last war, her army increased, and burning to avenge not only hostile acts, but the stinging insults which have been showered upon her. Finance, even in her case, is a restraint; but it is far less of a restraint in her case than in that of a sensitive commercial nation: suspension of payment would ruin the stockholders, many of whom are foreigners, but it would lighten the taxes, and bread and iron would not fail. Internal disturbance, if not more extensive than we believe that in Russia to be, might lead the government rather to desire than to avoid war. The shattered nerves of the Czar have shrunk from the conflict; but his heir is of a different temper, and would probably give the word for action. We take it all very coolly, because it never occurs to us that the very first stroke in a maritime war would probably be struck at Canadian shipping.

Austria, it appears, is destined once more to play her regular part with her regular ally, the reactionary party in England. In

times long past the heterogeneous group of principalities united under the sway of the House of Hapsburg served a useful purpose as a confederation against the Turk. But when Turkish conquest ceased to threaten, Austria, a military power without a nation, became simply a nuisance to humanity. Her office for some time past has been that of Tory turnkey in the gaol of oppressed and struggling nationalities. That office she performed both in Italy and Germany till Italy and Germany won their freedom, to the natural disgust of the courtly and aristocratic party in England who heartily sympathized with Bomba and pursued Garibaldi with intense hatred. Now, apparently, she has accepted the guardianship of the prison-house which holds the oppressed and struggling nationalities of the Balkan. Lord Salisbury hails the tidings of her assumption of the keys in the language applied by the Gospel to the tidings of the birth of Christ; and perhaps some apostle of Agnosticism will point with sarcastic exultation to this specimen of the moral and humane teachings of Christianity. But however glorious and beneficent may be the beginning the end will be the same. Humanity has not struggled so far up its steep and bloodstained path only to have its steps arrested at last in the interest of Lord Salisbury and his confederates. Destitute of life herself, Austria will not be able for ever to preserve herself from dissolution by stifling life around her. She has hitherto failed, as she was likely to fail, in the attempt to fuse Magyar and Sclav, Dalmatian and German, into a nation by bringing their representatives together in a jangling Parliament at Vienna. The process has served rather to intensify antagonisms which slept while the Principalities were left to carry on their somewhat torpid lives with no connection but that of a Royal and administrative centre. Everybody divines that the day will come when German Austria will be drawn into the Germanic Confederation and Hungary and Bohemia will go each its own way, while of the territory on the Adriatic a part at least will be united to Italy, and the smaller Sclavonic provinces will follow the fortunes of the kindred com-

munities which are gradually emancipating themselves from the Turkish yoke. It is not unlikely that "the next Sick Man" may now have taken a step useful to his political allies, but fatal to himself. A war with the great Sclavonic power would probably close his history.

Italian independence, and Garibaldi as its hero, have always been special objects of antipathy to the present Prime Minister of England, whose darling aim it is to identify himself with Courts, and to clothe himself in the radiant vesture of their attendants. The feeling is now extended with undiminished intensity to Greece, whose resurrection half a century ago kindled in England the passionate enthusiasm which sent Byron to die in her cause. It is true that in those days there was no overland route to India, and the chill of suppressed interest had not come over the native warmth of generous sympathy. Greece, however, like Italy, finds friends; and once more the petty objects of a particular government or class will succumb to the great objects of humanity.

—From South Africa still come tidings of disturbance, the malcontents now including the Boers, a rough race, who went out into the wilderness to live after their own fashion. So the "peace policy" is pronounced a failure, and troops may soon be on their march to chastise the perverseness of these races, which refuse quietly to blot themselves out of existence, that the Jingo may inherit the earth. Through one more river of blood South Africa is to wade to the reign of felicity designed for her by the beneficent genius of Lord Carnarvon. South African Confederation is a Downing Street dream, and a dream from which Downing Street itself appears at last to be awakening. Such a group of Provinces as the Cape Colony proper, Kaffraria, Basuto-land, Fingo-land, No-man's-land, Griqualand and the Transvaal, with their motley population of English, Dutch, German, French, Africanders, Hottentots, Malays and Kaffirs, the native element in some of the Provinces

vastly preponderating over the European, are incapable of Federal Union. The difficulties which we encounter even here would there be multiplied fourfold. But it was to fulfil this vision, plainly enough, that the annexation of Zululand, which a glance at the map will show to have been a Naboth's vineyard, was decreed. The Zulu King was summoned to change all the customs of his country, and to put down his army, which is called a body of "celibate manslayers," as though that were not the exact description of the standing army of the conquerors. He knew what was coming at the back of that demand, and he was attacked, as informants at the Cape tell us, before the period assigned in the ultimatum had expired.

The victor tramples down the vanquished; sometimes he even tramples down opinion for the time; but he does not write history. In history Cetewayo will stand by the side of Caractacus, Arminius and Boadicea, as a brave barbarian who in fighting for his land and his simple rights, fought, though unconsciously, for the hope of a race, selected by nature, perhaps, as the vigorous stock of a great nation—for a wild vine, which, under kindly culture, might in time have borne rich fruit to humanity. If to the Angles, Jutes and Saxons there had come, instead of the missionary, Jingoism with its arms of precision, would the name of the Jingo have been blessed? Yet the Ethelberts and the Edwins were in civilization little above the level of Cetewayo. As to the Zulu people, with equal arms, they would evidently be a match for their destroyers. They charged upon the fire of breech-loaders with a valour not displayed by any troops in the Franco-German war.

"The next day our coloured brethren came on and attacked the camp in numbers from 20,000 to 23,000, and after six hours' hard fighting they bolted. We killed a little over 2,300, and when once they retired all the horsemen in camp followed them for eight miles, butchering them all over the place. I told the men 'No quarter, boys, and remember yesterday.' And they did knock them about, killing them all over the place."

"For fully seven miles I chased two columns of the enemy,

who tried to escape over the Umvorlosi, but I came before them and pushed them off the road. They fairly ran like bucks, but I was after them like the whirlwind, and shooting incessantly into the thick column, which could not have been less than 5,000 strong. They became exhausted, and shooting them down would have taken too much time; so we took the assegais from the dead men, and rushed among the living ones, stabbing them right and left with fearful revenge for the murders of the 28th ult. No quarter was given." What effect are this work, and the derisive and exulting pictures of torture, death, agony, and hideous carnage, which are now common in English illustrated journals, likely to have on English character? And what but her character makes the connection with England dear and precious to us?

—In the early part of this century the Hon. Mountstuart Elphinstone visited Afghanistan as a British ambassador, and his book is a standard work upon the subject. He contrasts the state of the gallant clansmen with that of the despotisms around them. "In Persia or India, a tyrant, or a disputed succession, reduces the nation to a state of weakness or decay, from which it cannot wholly be released before its recovery is checked by the recurrence of a similar clamity. In Afghanistan, on the contrary, the internal government of the tribes answers its end so well that the utmost disorders of the royal government never derange its operations, nor disturb the lives of the people. A number of organized and high-spirited republics are ready to defend their rugged country against a tyrant, and are able to defy the feeble efforts of a party in a civil war. Accordingly, if we compare the condition of the two kingdoms, we find Persia in a state of decay, after twenty years of entire tranquillity; while Afghanistan continues the progressive improvement which it has kept up during twelve years of civil warfare." New aqueducts, Elphinstone says, are being constantly made, and new lands are being brought under

cultivation in all the districts not immediately within the range of the struggle between pretenders to the throne of Cabul. The observer finds in the Afghans, the clansman's faults, but he finds also, the clansman's virtues. "They are fond of liberty, faithful to their friends, kind to their dependents, hospitable, brave, hardy, frugal, laborious and prudent; and they are less disposed than the nations in their neighbourhood to falsehood, intrigues and deceit." Their women are chaste, and are well treated. They are not without culture, and great lovers of poetry of a simple sort. Their great patriot leader was a poet. In them apparently there is promise as high as there can be in any wild stock of humanity. But they are undisciplined and comparatively ill provided with arms, while their independent spirit renders a permanent union of their clans difficult, as will probably soon appear. They will be conquered and crushed into the mass of helpless and degraded misery upon which they have hitherto looked down from the mountain home of freedom.

The Afghan clansmen are styled "rebels." As rebels they are being slaughtered, and their villages are being burned, while their wives and children are driven out to die on the wintry hills. They are rebels just in the same sense as the Scotch were when they rose under Wallace against the vassal government set up by the conqueror's power. A pretended insult (for the most trustworthy authorities say that none was ever really offered), was the pretext of the war: the cause, soon and frankly avowed, was the desire of a scientific frontier. At the back of that desire was the ambition, long cherished by a party in the conqueror's councils, of annexing Afghanistan. We have had all this before. In 1837, Sir Alexander Burnes was sent to Cabul by Lord Palmerston to unveil Russian ascendancy, and to make a report which would countenance invasion. Being an honest man and a faithful public servant, he made a report which did not countenance invasion. The invasion, nevertheless, took place, and the result was an Afghan Bannockburn. Papers were called for, and the des-

patches by Sir Alexander Burnes, which, if produced in their genuine state, would have condemned the government, were laid before the House mutilated so as apparently to justify its policy. Burnes had perished, and could tell no tales. Many years afterwards the authentic despatches came to light and the forgery, for that was its true name, was exposed. If any one doubts our statement, let him refer to Hansard for March 19th, 1861.

An embargo has been laid upon correspondence by the Indian Government, and the curtain has fallen between us and Cabul. But we can guess what has been going on behind that curtain. The English reign of terror in captured Delhi according to witnesses, whose authority seemed good to Lord Elgin, was more cruel than the three days massacre of Nadir Shah. Do we fancy that Englishmen cannot be bloodthirsty? Spaniards were not bloodthirsty till they were launched in a career of blood. By evil work the nature is turned to evil. But the Englishmen does not enter Afghanistan alone; with him march Sikhs and other native mercenaries, compared with whom the Cossack is civilized and merciful.

On the question of mere policy, the opposite views were represented by the late Lord Lawrence and Lord Lytton. Lord Lawrence, an illustrious man of action, was naturally inclined to a policy of moderation. Lord Lytton, a poetaster and a dandy, is as naturally inclined to a policy of thunderbolts. That the Hindoos like other races hate alien rule, and prefer that even of the worst of their native Princes, is well-known, and was proved by the rising of the peasantry in favour of so vile a dynasty as that of Oude: yet they have submited, because they are disarmed, and because, look where they would, there was no hope of deliverance. But now the spears of a deliverer will gleam in the sight of the Sepoy. We strangely forget the radical difference between the two Empires, which will henceforth touch each other. The Russian Empire, though vast, is in a ring fence: it is formed by the extension of a comparatively civilized power over an adjacent territory which is a sort

of political vacuum sparsely occupied by semibarbarous tribes. What Russia annexes she incorporates; what she incorporates she, in time, assimilates; all the more easily because the conqueror is in civilization not so much above the level of the conquered. She has apparently no reason to fear disaffection among the races under her settled rule in the East. But British India is a distant possession, the communication with which would be almost cut by a war with any one of the maritime powers of Europe. Its rulers are a race not only of aliens, but of mere sojourners, who have not even a life interest in the country, the spoils of which they bear off to another land. The social line between conqueror and conquered is as sharp and cruel as ever. If the natives were dogs, says Lord Elgin, you might at least caress them, and whistle to them; but as it is, you have no kindly relations with them of any sort. That mutual ignorance is complete as well as mutual estrangement, the sudden outburst of the mutiny was a fearful proof. Here lies the peril of the Indian Empire; here and in those ever growing difficulties of finance, which compel a Christian government—a government, at least, which establishes Christianity, and patronizes missionaries—to raise annually eight millions sterling by forcing opium, at the point of the bayonet, on the Chinese, whose rulers have tried in vain to save their people from the physical and moral poison.

That Russsia as well as England has been playing her game at the Court of Cabul may well be believed; of course she would look out there and everywhere else for allies when England threatened her with war. That she was actually standing behind the Afghans seemed to be disproved when the English, on their first entrance, found no traces of her assistance—above all when they found no Russian guns. To supply the clansmen with good firearms would have been her most natural move. Now two or three thousand of them are said to have Snider rifles, and they are evidently making a stand for their homes, which, though it will be overcome, will add considerably to the financial difficulties and somewhat im-

pair the prestige of the Empire. It is singular that even the Government with all its experience seems not to have distinctly seen that the conflict would be not with a monarchy which one blow might prostrate, but with a number of high-spirited, warlike, and virtually independent clans defending a country singularly suited to irregular warfare. The late Ameer, supported by the judicious friendship of Lord Lawrence, had made some progress in centralization: but his work was quite incomplete; a blow has laid it in the dust, and the occupation af Cabul is not the posssession of a seat of government but of a city surrounded by tribes which care no more than Highlanders in the Middle Ages for the claim of allegiance or the epithet of rebel.

—By the ascendancy of Jingoism in the central orb the same fire has been set glowing in all the satellites. In addition to Lord Lytton's war in Afghanistan and that of Sir Bartle Frere in Zululand, the ground is apparently being laid for a spirited policy in Burmah, Siam, and possibly Abyssinia. These miserable races are all unprovided with improved arms, and therefore they will all be slaughtered with ease. We are told that if certain measures now in contemplation take effect, Canadian soldiers may have the privilege of taking part in the work, as the comrades of the Sikhs and the Ghoorkas. There are some among us whom that thought fills with pride; there are others whom it does not fill with pride; and as both parties are sincere, they must respect the sentiments of each other.

One after another these vast fabrics of iniquity are reared by cupidity and ambition; one after another they are cast down. There is a power in the world, be it Deity or be it Ozone, which forbids man to build his happiness on the misery of his fellows. But in this Jingo and Music Hall Imperialism what strikes us most is not the iniquity but the vulgarity. A new member once rose to address the House of Commons "very showily attired, being dressed in a bottle-green frock-coat and a waist-

coat of white of the Dick Swiveller pattern, the front of which exhibited a network of glittering chains; large fancy pattern pantaloons and a black tie, above which no shirt collar was visible." That costume, translated into a foreign policy, now dazzles all whom nature has made susceptible of such influences. But let the trumpets blare as loud as they will, these fillibustering raids with Gatling guns and Martini-Henry rifles on wretches who have no defence but their naked valour, bear no relation to the famous wars waged by England in defence of right against the great powers of evil, Philip II., and Louis XIV., and Napoleon.

"My country, right or wrong"—to say this is to renounce humanity and to defy God. When the demagogues of the United States drove their country into an iniquitous war with England, the opponents of that crime were denounced for want of patriotism, just as the opponents of Jingo crime are now. Webster replied, "With respect to the war in which we are now involved, the course which our principles require us to pursue cannot be doubtful. It is now the law of the land, and as such we are bound to regard it. Resistance and insurrection form no part of our creed. The disciples of Washington are neither tyrants in power nor rebels out. If we are taxed to carry on this war, we shall disregard certain distinguished examples and shall pay. If our personal services are required, we shall yield them to the precise extent of our constitutional liability. At the same time the world may be assured that we know our rights, and shall exercise them. We shall express our opinion on this, as on every measure of government, I trust without passion, I am certain, without fear. We have yet to learn that the extravagant progress of pernicious measures abrogates the duty of opposition, or that the interest of our native land is to be abandoned by us in the hour of her thickest dangers and sorest necessity. By the exercise of our constitutional right of suffrage, by the peaceable remedy of election, we shall seek to restore wisdom to our councils and peace to our country."

That the policy of the English Government is that of the country, however, is an assertion which the Government itself seems greatly to doubt. Again and again the Ministers have been on the very brink of a dissolution; again and again they have shrunk from it, though they would most gladly have renewed their seven years' lease of power. Mr. Gladstone's triumphal progress has only placed in a striking light that which was well known before—that the moral sense and intelligence of Scotland and the North were opposed to Jingoism, which has its seat among the Southern aristocracy and the populace of London and other cities enfranchised by the Tory Reform Bill of 1867, and organized under Conservative Working Men's Associations, of which an important agency is beer.

What the result will be when an appeal is at last made to the country, no one who is really well-informed as to the balance of parties in England would presume at present to decide. The scale may be turned by events, the course of which shifts from hour to hour. The result of the election at Sheffield is an important sign. For Sheffield, though a centre of industry, is an outpost of Jingoism in the North, as it showed by giving a large majority to the ultra Jingo, Mr. Roebuck: a large element of roughness and violence, not to say of rowdyism, is generated by its dangerous trades. Moreover its industries are to a considerable extent war industries, and they are specially feeling the revival. Big with fate will be the day in which England decides between industry and conquest. This is the grand issue: County franchise and disestablishment, important as they are, sink into a secondary place, compared with the question of the hour. The Liberal Party, if it is wise, will set them entirely aside. Hypothec, in Scotland, it must take up; and it may perhaps do well by taking up the land question in England if it can get its Whig leaders to face the subject.

In the meantime the very basis of aristocracy is being sapped by those economic forces which have almost always played a great part in political revolutions. Brighter suns will bring better

harvests, but American competition will always keep down the price of British wheat. 'Even meat and dairy produce, to which the English farmer looked as his last rampart, are now imported almost with the same facility as grain. The revival of the Corn Law is out of the question; it would raise a rebellion in the manufacturing North. Rents and the value of land must fall. The incomes of the landlords must be reduced, and many of them, already deeply sunk in incumbrances, will hardly escape ruin. Their case will be the worse because land in England, having a social and political as well as an economical value, has been largely bought at a fancy price. Henceforth indeed it will be scarcely possible for English land to carry three—the landlord, the tenant-farmer, and the labourer Tenants being difficult to get will become independent, they will demand leases instead of tenancies at will; and the hierarchy of rural society will be subverted. Then it will be seen that aristocracy, whatever it may have been in Norman times, is now merely plutocracy with a coronet, and that when its wealth departs, it is a thing of feudal shreds and patches that can neither rule nor dazzle any more.

The enthusiastic reception of Mr. Gladstone by the people, has been a revelation not only to his opponents but to the politicians of his own party. The same thing happened before: in 1867, when he had been out-manœuvred by Mr. Disraeli on the suffrage question. The politicians were inclined to desert him; but they found that the people were faithful to him, and that to be elected for a Liberal constituency it was necessary to conjure with his name. Errors in tactics, which to Parliamentary strategists seem fatal, affect the masses not at all; a lofty, pure and simple character, combined with commanding eloquence and great general force, retains its hold on their affections, and if its possessor is defeated by strategy, instead of deserting him, they only want to crush the strategists. A brilliant leader has become more than ever necessary in England, since the extension of the franchise has immensely increased the size of the constituencies, and included numbers who have not political know-

ledge enough to attach themselves to a great cause unless it is embodied in the form of a great man. This renders the arrival of Mr. Gladstone's seventieth birthday a very serious element in the horoscope of the future.

Commerce in England begins to revive. The causes of the depression unquestionably were over-production and over-multiplication of the means of production, especially in the textile department, stimulated by ten years of extraordinary prosperity. It happened that at the same time there was a pause in the construction of railways, and a consequent reduction in the demand for iron. Of money there has all along been not only abundance but a superabundance, so that the rate of interest in England on deposits became almost nominal: it was of profitable investments that there was a lack. The market has now been pretty well unloaded, and the construction of railroads has recommenced. But England can never recover the lonely pre-eminence in manufactures which was hers on the morrow of the great French wars. Other nations are coming up with her in the race. Still she has a vast mass of accumulated wealth; she greedily takes foreign and colonial investments on all sides. The New Zealand loan is subscribed for twice over, though it can hardly be the very safest of securities, considering that New Zealand has, with this addition, a public debt of twenty-five millions sterling, for a white population under half a million. The number of matriculations at the English Universities has not fallen off; and the watering places have been crowded throughout the depression.

Mr. Delane, the thrice-famous editor of the *London Times* is dead, and Journalism is called upon to give him a royal funeral! Our response must depend upon our notion of a journalist's duty. Ought he write from conviction, or ought he to write simply what will sell? Mr. John Delane was what is called in gentle phrase "an opportunist," that is, he wrote what would sell. His art, which he carried to the highest pitch, was that of divining the tendency of opinion and, by anticipating, appearing to lead it; such an art, however, like other kinds of legerde-

main, loses its magic, when its secret is once revealed. Moreover, the opinion which Mr. Delane's *Times* skilfully reflected, in later years at least, was not that of the nation, but that of the Clubs. With the Clubs as his oracles he went right on most small questions: on the great questions, from the repeal of the Corn Laws down to the American Civil War, he went egregiously wrong. He had never studied; he had no information but that which he picked up from day to day; and the great forces which work beneath the surface, and in the upshot govern the course of events were to him unknown. But when destiny declared against him he went round at a moment's notice: the Clubs, which had shared his error, easily overlooked it; and his infallibility, though destroyed by the news of the evening, was renewed with the tea and muffins of the morrow. When he was first installed in the editorial chair, his journal was the paper of the people: it gradually became what it now is, exclusively the paper of the rich. Its sphere of influence has also been narrowed since the repeal of the paper duty by the development of the great Northern press. It speaks for nobody north of Birmingham, and only for the Upper Ten south of it. We only wonder that a vestige of the old Liberalism remains. As a newspaper in the strict sense of the term the *Times* is still supreme, but its editorials are the regulation column and a half, old style.

When the "society journal" and the "professional beauty" fall out, morality is not likely to be the loser. On the society journals the vials of righteous indignation have been copiously poured. But who supports society journals? Where are they seen—only in pothouses and gambling hells like the *Age* and *Satirist* of former days, or on the tables of the people who denounce them? The society journal, the professional beauty, Baron Albert Grant and the dominant political morality are four kindred products of the same era.

—In Ireland the immemorial quarrel seems to have broken out once more. The war of religion has been secondary though

intensely embittering; the main struggle was always for the land. The Irish have been charged as a people with lack of patriotic courage and pointed out as proper prey for the spoiler by the most untruthful writer who ever profaned the calling of a historian. They were uncentralized and therefore unorganized as well as inferior in arms and war material, when the Norman robber came upon them. But they did in their separate septs fight long and hard for their country: at the end of three centuries they had reduced the territory of the conqueror almost to the frontiers of his capital. It was not without a desperate and protracted struggle that their resistance in the field was crushed even by the powerful monarchy of the Tudors, and it was renewed with fearful energy in the reign of Charles I. and again at the end of the last century. Of late, however, the war between the descendants of the confiscators and the disinherited people has taken an agrarian form. That is the true presentment of the case: the districts where agrarian violence has most prevailed have been singularly free from ordinary crime. The Irish farmer has clung desperately to his homestead: for him there were not as for the suffering Englishman great manufacturing cities to which he might turn his steps for bread: eviction has to him been destitution. And now threatened with famine by a bad harvest he turns once more to bay. In the political part of the Home Rule movement there is comparatively little force; it lacks, above all things, definiteness of aim. Yet Irish Nationality is not dead: the sentiment is still strong though it is vague; and the long struggle has produced a great body of patriotic poetry, oratory, history, and biography which forms the only literature of the people, as the portraits of patriot martyrs form its art. How deep a root the feeling has we see by the passionate constancy with which it is cherished by Irish exiles in distant lands, who force their detractors to confess that in undying love of country at least they are by no means inferior to the conquerors. Had the wearers of the English crown done their duty graciously

to Ireland, they too might have found a place in the Irish heart; for the Irish, thanks to their calamitous history, are only too susceptible of attachment to persons and too little of attachment to institutions. But no English king set foot in Ireland from the Battle of the Boyne to the accession of George IV, and in the present reign there have been only two Royal visits, one of them so brief that it seemed like a manifestation of dislike, though the reception on the first occasion had been everything that could be desired.

The Tory Government of England fancies that it has bought the Irish nation with a Catholic University. The bishops, perhaps, it has bought, and a part of the priests, but not the Irish nation. A change has of late been coming over the scene. Once completely identified with the national cause, the clergy, their own ends having been gained by disestablishment, have now begun to pass over to the side of reaction, while the laity are still pressing forward to their mark. The hierarchy especially have been turning against the people. But the consequence is that the eyes of the people are opened. Without losing their attachment to their religion, they are beginning to draw the proper line between the things which belong to the priest, and the things which belong to the citizen. There are countries, perhaps, in which a politician can still go to an Episcopal palace and buy the Irish vote as he would buy a sack of potatoes; but in Ireland he can do so no longer. If the priests do not confine themselves to their own sphere, they will some day teach the Irishman to regard the Church as the enemy of his country.

It is needless to say that armed resistance on the part of the peasantry would be easily put down; but it is an awkward employment for a government to be collecting rents with bayonets. The English Ministers have shrunk from acting with vigour against the leaders of the agitation, as in the House of Commons they shrank from acting with vigour against the Irish Obstructionists. They have the fear of the coming election and the Irish vote before their eyes. A Tory government, like

the Papacy under its present conditions, is stronger at the extremities than it is at the heart.

In France the barque of moderate Republican Government labours heavily in the boiling sea that rolls in upon it from all quarters of the political compass, as it were in the heart of a cyclone. Any moment may bring its catastrophe. Among the immediate causes of the crisis, the principal is the return of the amnestied Communists, which has stirred up from their depths all the Communistic feeling on the one side, and all the antagonism to it on the other. Of the hour, Gambetta is probably master; that is, he can say whether the present ministers shall retire, and whether he shall himself take the place for which, with a patient and wary ambition rarely found in a great popular leader, he has been reserving and preparing himself all these years. What will happen afterwards no Frenchman ventures to predict, nor would a forecast be possible without an almost miraculous power of reading, not only the superficial phenomena of politics, but the deepest workings of the national mind. Two great bodies of opinion are forming themselves like two thunderclouds, big with the explosive elements of a tremendous storm. The difference is now social rather than political. On one side are those who desire to preserve the present social order, the present relations between classes, between capital and labour, between employer and employed, and the ecclesiastical system as a guaranty of the social. On the other side are those whom Conservative fear and hatred paint as fanatics thirsting for "the regeneration of society," and for "the abolition of capital, funds, taxes, the army, the judiciary and religion." In a word, on the one side are the enemies, on the other the children, of the revolution. Purely political questions as to the form of Goverment, have for the present, rather receded into the background. The Republic is accepted by those whose wish is peace, and no attempt to substitute a monarchy for it is at present being made in an organized

and active form. Of the dynasties, for the moment, little is said. Bonapartism has been stunned by the loss of its pretender, while his collateral heir, though now regularly in the position of a claimant, is at once personally odious to a large section of the party, and unwilling to risk his ease and safety for the purpose of plucking a pear, which he probably thinks will, when ripe, fall into his mouth. The Comte de Chambord is a perfectly honest believer in the divinity of kings, and of the priest as the associate of the king; and he never opens his lips without making himself an impossibility for all who are not prepared to go back to Louis XIV. A sort of haze has come of late over the House of Orleans; the Duc d'Aumale, eminently fitted for the part of a Liberal-Conservative head of the State, has gone off the political scene; the Comte de Paris, a man of quiet, amiable character and literary tastes is evidently not disposed to strike or conspire, while the relations into which his House has entered with the representative of the elder branch make it impossible for him in the lifetime of the Comte de Chambord to appear as an avowed pretender. A natural rallying point for all the Conservatives, Legitimists, Orleanists, and Bonapartists is found in the Church, which is now the great bulwark of Conservatism in Europe, and is, for the same reason, the object not only of philosophical disbelief, but of political and social hatred among those who look forward to a new order of things. Once more parties seem likely to be divided by a religious line. Not that the Bonapartists as a party are religious; if they have a deity it is Napoleon I., if they have a faith it is in the star that guides to plunder; but like Napoleon I. himself, the most thoroughgoing of Atheists, they see in the church a political power which it is desirable to secure as a subordinate ally. The same thing may be said in a modified form of the Orleanists, whose great statesmen Guizot, though himself a Protestant and a rationalist, became in his later years a strong supporter of the Papacy as a Conservative institution. In the so-called religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there

was in like manner a large political element, for the crimes of which religion has been held responsible, though no one can be so ignorant as to suppose that religion had any share in the action of the Guises, or of Catherine de Medicis. The education question—the question whether the mind of the citizen shall be formed by the Priest, or by the Republic, is the field upon which battle will speedily be joined by two hosts more radically opposed to each other in all beliefs, tendencies and aims, than perhaps were ever before two sections of the same nation. The same war has long been raging in Belgium, and seems to be on the point of breaking out in the United States.

On the other hand, in every country, however divided, the number is always large of those who belong heartily to neither party, but are swayed in the main by their material interests; and this is sure to be specially the case in a country wearied with revolutions. It is not unlikely that this neutral mass may now throw its weight into the Conservative scale. All the timid, and most of the property-holding, citizens must have been scared by the Red Spectre raised again by the return of the Communists.

As to the Church, whatever her power may be, her fidelity to the cause of reaction need not be doubted. From the language of her champions it is plain that she has lost, and knows that she has lost, her hold on the intellect of the world; her domain, as her chiefs must be conscious, now nearly coincides, so far as simple and sincere belief is concerned, with the absence of popular education. But in two characters she is still strong, and knows that she is strong; as the asylum for minds which seek in blind submission a refuge from religious doubt, and as the patroness and oracle of resistance to progress. In progress of any kind, political or social, as well as intellectual, is her bane: of that she is doubly convinced since the ill-starred attempts of Pio Nono to lead reform in Italy, and of Lamennais and his school to unmoor her from the social past and set her afloat on the rising tide of democracy to the tune of "*L'Avenir vaut bien le Passé*." Even Montalembert, her great champion

and orator, died under her displeasure because he was not wholly devoid of sympathy with liberty. It is quite as much political reaction as mental infirmity that gives her so many converts among the aristocratic class in England. On our continent it is only in the character of a saviour from religious doubt and perplexity that she is likely to win converts among the educated. Here she will always have a hard life. Miracle and relic have hitherto been very wary in visiting the New World; and the recent incursion of St. Emilius with his bones has produced results which must have led the Saint to doubt the wisdom, though he may glory in the boldness, of his enterprise.

In Germany, also, the concentration of the Conservative forces to resist the advance of Socialism is the leading feature of the situation. But in Germany the powers of political and religious reaction, before they can take the field against the common foe have to make up a deadly quarrel between themselves. The Roman Catholic Church has been in fierce collision with the Prussian bureaucracy on that very subject of education which presents a field for the united action of political and religious Conservatives in France. Antagonism is now giving way to a sense of common interest and mutual need; but when the dispute has been carried to such a height, after the heavy blows which the iron hand of Prussian secularism has dealt on one side, and the Papal thunders which have been hurled upon the other, to devise a mode of reconciliation is not easy even for a statesman so entirely free from prejudice and so thoroughly opportunist as Bismarck. Hitherto diplomacy has done its best without much result. Rome cannot abide the education laws and Bismarck "will not go to Canossa." A fundamental community of interest, however, may be expected, in face of growing danger, to prevail over mutual hatred. Leo XIII. is evidently far more of an Italian Statesman and less of an Ultramontane Infallibility than his self-martyred and hysterical predecessor; though even he, when it comes to such a question as that of the Education laws, is obliged to remember that his trade is to be Pope.

—The contemptuous, not to say contumelious, language which has been applied in certain quarters to the productions of the Canadian pen, has called forth some indignant replies. Supposing that Canada has no literature, this does not prove that her sons have no literary faculties, nor is it a disgrace peculiar to her. What dependency ever had a literature? The whole history of mind shows us that there is a close connection between the intellectual fruitfulness of a nation and its general life. The stirrings of literary activity appeared in this country simultaneously with a faint beating of the pulse of nationality. But Canada has what we are bound to regard as a literature better than any which she could herself hope to produce. She has the gracious speeches of flattering Earls and the precepts of a Lord Chamberlain on the subject of court etiquette embodied in the treatise of Professor Fanning. Nor has she failed to make some progress in art. We remember that some time ago the writer of an editorial on one of our art exhibitions, directed particular atttention to certain photographs as having received the special approbation of the Duke of Manchester. There are some things which, to the uncourtly taste, are more repulsive than "literary hog wash" itself. That Canada has writers, capable, with fair treatment, of producing for her something better than either, is the conviction of judges who, if long experience can teach them, ought to know good writing from bad.

It falls within the scope of our design to notice books, not as literary works, but as events and landmarks in the history of opinion; preserving in this department, as in our survey of events generally, the Canadian point of view, and giving priority to Canadian publications. But in this opening number literary occurrences have been excluded by political arrears.

We have merely to add in laying the BYSTANDER before the reader that we have endeavoured to secure good assistance in different parts of the Dominion; so that if we fall into error, with regard to matters of fact, as it is too likely that we often shall, it will at least not be through wilful neglect of the

proper means of information. With regard to matters of opinion, we can only say that it will be our endeavour always to write honestly and frankly; and that when called on to express our sentiments on controverted points, we will give the reasons of our convictions to the best of our power.

THE BYSTANDER.

FEBRUARY, 1880.

THE BYSTANDER now bears a motto embodying our main object and our guiding principle in treating Canadian affairs. Whether our aim is a narrow propagandism or as broad a view as we are able to take of the events of the time, our readers will judge not from hostile or fanciful representations, but from that which is before them. Our success has greatly exceeded our hopes, and promises a circulation at least double of that for which we were prepared.

The next great Canadian event will be the meeting of Parliament. The Ministerial majority is overwhelming; under ordinary circumstances it would be too large for party discipline; but its members will be kept in order by the fear of losing their seats, as some of them undoubtedly would, if they were now compelled to go to the country. Even the friends of the N. P. admit that there is a certain amount of disappointment. Election promises are always pitched too high; and assuredly the N. P. campaign formed no exception to the general rule. But there is a deeper cause of disappointment than this. The new tariff is a right measure in itself, taking for granted the soundness of the general policy to which it has relation, and which consists in carrying Imperialism into our economical affairs; but, as we are persuaded, that policy is the reverse of sound. The other pillar of the party, besides the tariff, is the ability of its chief. There is a good deal of talk, premature and therefore impolitic, about the successor of Sir John Macdonald, and attempts

are made by active spirits, whose efforts are rather on the surface, to press particular candidates. "Dear Brother," said Charles II. to the Duke of York, who had officiously offered him his guard, "depend upon it, nobody will kill me to make you king." The Premier might say something of the same kind to his heir designate, and no doubt he would say it with all the urbanity of Charles II. Sir John Macdonald will have no successor. In England the Conservative party is a territorial aristocracy holding all the landed wealth of the country, flanked by a commercial plutocracy which aspires to connection with it and by a highly endowed State Church. It has definite principles, vital and dear to all its adherents, which may be summed up in the one word 'Privilege.' It forms, and till it is sapped by the economical and intellectual forces will continue to form, a permanent and self-supporting mass, comparatively little affected by the qualities of the leader for the time being. Mr. Pitt dies, Mr. Percival lives; and though the commanding voice is silent, the votes remain with the interest to which they belong. The "beacon on the hill" is extinct; but a candle suffices to light the friends of Privilege into their own lobby. It is not so here. Since the overthrow of the Family Compact, the disestablishment of the State Church, and the abolition of the Seigniories, Conservatism has had no permanent basis except, perhaps, Orangeism and its strangely assorted ally, the Roman Catholic theocracy of Quebec. At most, it has a basis of sentiment, the feebleness of which, compared with material interest, its own victory at the last general election revealed. It is simply a combination formed by a particular leader whose genius and fortune have drawn followers from every camp. When he leaves the scene, the combination will come to an end. Whether among his present lieutenants anyone will be found capable of putting it together again and leading it as it has been led, we shall see when the time comes. We hope better things—perhaps, also, we fear worse. We hope that partyism will have somewhat declined, and that to form a sectional government will not be so

easy. We fear that financial embarrassment will have reached a point at which it will absolutely compel the nation to put an end to the game.

—There is reason to believe that a Civil Service Bill will be among the measures brought forward by the Government. The clamour of eighteen thousand applicants for appointments, and the maledictions of seventeen thousand nine hundred malcontents, have probably helped not a little to convince the Prime Minister of the expediency of this reform; though we believe it may justly be said of him that when party has let him alone, he has done, in his own way, his best for the public service, and that his appointments, his judicial appointments especially, as often as he has made them freely, have been good. Civil Service Reform in England, also, owes its existence in no small degree to Ministerial desperation. The advantages of high training will, perhaps, not be so conspicuous in a community such as ours as they are in the communities of the Old World; we have no diplomatic service, and the general intelligence and versatility of our people make them pretty good administrators even without special preparation. Even in the United States, the evils of the present system, so far as efficiency is concerned, are apt to be a good deal overstated. But the advantage of a permanent and responsible service, consisting of men whose character and livelihood depend entirely on their integrity, and whom, if they do wrong, no person or party has any interest in screening, must in every country be very great. By its institution, with the necessary adjunct of adequate salaries, British India was turned from a looting ground into a civil administration remarkable for its purity, whatever the general effects of British rule may be. Equally desirable is it to do away with a patronage which aggravates all the evils of party government, and which is rapidly breeding a vast profession of adventurers following the camp of a party, instead of making their bread by honest trades. When Sir John Macdonald came into power with a

great majority given him, not by party machinery, but by a national movement, there were those who hoped that he would show his sense of his position by widening the basis of government. Old ties and old habits were too much for him; the only instance in which he has responded to our hopes is the renewal of his connection with Sir Alexander Galt. But if he will carry a good Civil Service Bill, we shall owe to him no inconsiderable step towards our final deliverance from the reign of faction and corruption.

The mention of Civil Service Reform always sets going a debate on the subject of competitive examinations. In the case of India that system seems to have answered well; the late Lord Lawrence, a man of action if ever there was one, pronounced its results good. But it has its weak points. It is apt to lead to overstraining and cramming. It is apt, also, by the attraction of a prize, which to a boy and his parents seems at the moment great, to draw into a clerk's place a youth who has abilities above it and who presently grows discontented. It would be invidious to dwell on the superior securities which England has for the absolute integrity of the examinations and awards. China has a perfect system of competitive examination which is said to be a screen for corruption from top to bottom. Responsible appointment, with sufficient test examinations, entire immunity from removal on party grounds, and promotion by merit within the office, seem Civil Service Reform enough for a community such as ours.

—As both the leaders of the Opposition have declared for a reform of the Senate and neither of them has been court-martialed, ground will probably be broken on that question. "Reform" is a wrong word, because it implies abuse; there is no abuse, except in the case of any senators who may have taken the honour and the pay without doing their duty; there is only an experiment in constitution building which has failed, and the failure of which, in general opinion, calls for a change.

Nor can the Prime Ministers who have successively exercised the power of nomination be justly blamed for the result. Expectations that "the Crown" would fill the Senate with men of a different class from those who composed the Lower House —men superior in any mental or social qualifications, less involved in the faction fight, better fitted to represent commercial interests or scientific professions—were foredoomed to inevitable disappointment. "The Crown" is the Prime Minister; and no Prime Minister who was at the head of a party could help doing what the Prime Ministers on both sides have done—bestowing the nominations as rewards for party services and making the Senate, what it is, a political infirmary. Under the party system, whatever patronage is put into the hands of Government is sure to fall into the general bribery fund by which a party government is sustained. In England a peerage is now and then given for military or naval services, seldom for public services of any other kind, and an extra law lord has sometimes been created when the House, as a Court of Law, has been in absolute need of reinforcement. Otherwise, the only road to a peerage is through landed wealth and a long course of steady voting for the leader of a party.

Before we debate the question, how the Senate ought to be constituted, we must sacrifice on the altar of truth by frankly declaring our disbelief in Senates altogether. The illustrious Council from which the name is derived was not an Upper House but the government of the Roman Republic, having the executive practically under its control and the initiative of legislation in its hands. The American Senate is a special representation of the Federal as distinguished from the popular principle, in a country where, be it observed, foreign relations being in the hands of the national government, there are real federal functions to be discharged. But the other modern Senates are intended imitations of the House of Lords, and, one and all, begotten of the same illusion. The House of Lords is not a Senate, it is an old Feudal Estate, embodying not a political cast of mind different from that embodied in the House

of Commons, but a different interest, and at the dictate of that interest resisting to the uttermost every measure of change, from the Habeas Corpus Act to the mitigation of the Criminal Code, and from the mitigation of the Criminal Code to Parliamentary Reform. In no single instance, we are persuaded, can the House of Lords be shown to have discharged the supposed function of a Senate, by revising, in a calmer atmosphere and in the light of maturer wisdom, the rash resolutions of the Lower House. Its members are not older or more sedate, much less are they better informed or wiser than those of the House of Commons. They are simply members of an hereditary aristocracy maintaining the privileges of their order. For that object they readily passed the most revolutionary measure, in the worst sense of the term, recorded in the political history of England—the enfranchisement of the ignorant and irresponsible populace of the cities by the Tory Reform Bill of 1867. Yet the belief that they are a sage council of political revision has given birth to the double-chambered theory with the multifarious embodiments of which the British colonies and constitutional Europe are overspread.

Under elective institutions there can be no real power but that which rests on the suffrages of the people. Nominated Senates, such as the French Senate under the Restored Monarchy, and our Senate, are nullities, with a latent possibility of mischief, which was manifested the other day by the refusal of the supplies, for the purpose of a party *coup d'état*, by the Senate of Quebec. If an attempt is made to divide the real power by making both Houses elective, the result is a perpetual risk of collision, such as has twice produced a dead lock in Victoria, and in France came near the other day to replunging the country in civil war.

Not in complications, rivalries and conflicts is the necessary Conservative influence to be found, but in the proper constitution of a single assembly, in requiring such qualifications on the part of its electors, filling it up by such instalments, so regulating its legislative procedure that it may be an organ of

intelligence not of passion, and give effect to the settled convictions, not to the transient impulses, of the people. Then, instead of making the executive authority the prize of a perpetual faction fight, let an executive council be regularly elected by Parliament. The separation of the executive power from the legislative is a dream, though Montesquieu has established the belief that it is one of the great securities for liberty. Already Parliament appoints the Government, but in a way which makes it the government of a party, not of the nation.

Of what sort of men is the Upper House specially to consist? We have gone through projects without number, and volumes of discussion, yet we have never met with an answer to this essential question. Electoral or nominative machinery of all kinds is constructed, but nobody seems to know, or think it necessary to determine, what the machinery is to produce. Is the Upper House to be composed of old men?—It will be impotent. Of rich men?—It will be odious. Of the best and wisest men?—The Lower House, which, as the more popular remains the more powerful, will be left destitute of its natural guides and controllers. From this quandary, which, if we had space, might be illustrated historically, we really see no escape.

However, the principle of two chambers is established, and we take it as it is. The only way of giving the Senate real power, and making it a living institution, is to introduce the elective principle; and this, so far as we can see, must be done in one of two ways, either by giving the election of Senators to the Local Legislatures, or by giving it to the people of each Province. Much might be said in favour of the Local Legislatures, if they were what they ought to be, genuine local councils, consisting of the worthies of the districts, and if their members would vote freely. But, as it is, to give the election of senators to them would be to put it into the pocket of the leader of the party in power, which would be very much the reverse of an improvement on open and legal nomination by the Prime Minister of the Dominion. To the people of each Province then, apparently, the election must be given;

and we must hope that the largeness of the constituencies will, to some extent, baffle wirepulling, and that petty local influences being swamped, the feeling which the people always have for eminent leaders will prevail. The substitution of a term of years for life-tenure is a matter of course: it is necessary, both to secure a rotation of elections, and as a practical ordinance of superannuation. If the present Senators are allowed to retain their seats, the change will be gentle, and all fear of revolution, if anybody is so nervous as to entertain it, will be removed.

A mixed mode of election, if different constituencies could be devised, might not be without its advantages. It would introduce emulation, as well as temper, dominant influences, and prevent things from running in one bad groove. But to devise different constituencies is not easy, while the principle of representation might be enfeebled and obscured. The simple measure is probably the best, and certainly it is the one most likely to enlist the support of the people.

The Upper House in England is the Court of Impeachment, a function which it has always discharged as badly as possible when any political feeling was involved. Not many years ago a Colonial Governor, who was then in danger of impeachment for arbitrary and sanguinary misrule, was publicly assured, by a member of the House of Lords, that if he was brought before that House he would find in it a sympathizing tribunal. It seems doubtful whether the Canadian Senate shares the power. But either in the Senate, or in some more judicial body, a Court of Impeachment we ought to have. Political corruption, the bane and peril of these communities, is not less capable of legal definition than treason or sedition, and it will not be put down till it is treated as a crime. An investigation in the House of Commons is not a trial, but a faction fight, as we saw in the case of the Pacific Railway Scandal. Mr. Blake is the most eminent guardian of our political morality: the subject deserves his care.

—A field for many a party skirmish will, of course, be found in the new Tariff. The Finance Minister will be expected to say whether it has fulfilled, or is likely to fulfil, its direct objects, by bringing the revenue to the level of the expenditure. If an answer to this question is not at once forthcoming, he may perhaps put in a dilatory plea on the ground that the disturbance caused by the rush of importation which took place in anticipation of the new duties, has not yet entirely subsided. There are faults, such as the tendency to discourage the use of the lighter and more wholesome wines, which he may perhaps volunteer to correct. Debate as to the ultimate effect of the system on Canadian manufactures must at present be premature and inconclusive, though it will probably be copious and warm. It will be hardly possible for the leaders of the Opposition to plant a heavy blow. 'What would you have done yourselves to fill the deficit?' is a question which they have not yet attempted to answer, and till they have answered it, their criticism will be without a basis. One chance of a good division they may possibly have, but it will be one of which they will be unable to avail themselves consistently with their general position. It seems that Yorkshire is not so much concerned at the exclusion of the better class of goods as at that of the 'goods manufactured expressly for the Colonies,' generally termed shoddy. If in one quarter there is a tendency to use us as a slaughter market, there is just as strong a tendency to use us as a shoddy market in another. To the pressure in favour of shoddy, our highly Imperialist government may, it is surmised, be inclined to yield. The manufacturers on the Government side will almost certainly rebel and offer to the Opposition one of those opportunities for casting out Beelzebub by a temporary junction with his own forces from which party tacticians seldom shrink. But it unluckily happens that one of the grounds, if not the principal ground, of the attacks made by the Grits and their organs, especially their chief organ, on the new tariff, has been its disloyalty to British interests, and its consequent tendency to

loosen the bond of connection with the mother country, in the maintenance of which, it seems to be thought, shoddy has more influence than affection. There are two commercial policies for this country, of which every statesman, if he wishes to have firm ground under his feet and to be consistent in his utterances, must choose one. You may either determine to keep Canada economically apart from the continent to which geographically she belongs, and to connect her artificially with England, and with more remote countries; or you may determine to follow the course of nature, and identify Canada economically with her own continent. In the first of these policies, mingled with the economical element, there is a large measure of social sentiment. It is closely connected with the desire, cherished by the aristocratic party in England and its allies here, of erecting the northern part of this continent into a great outwork of the English aristocracy, so as to prevent the final triumph of democratic institutions in the New World. The second policy, on the other hand, is congenial to those who either are democratic in their own sympathies, or hold that the triumph of democracy in the New World is inevitable; and that Canada, if she is made the instrument of a desperate struggle to prevent it, will herself be brought to ruin. The first policy is pursued by the present Government, in perfect consistency with the antecedents of its leading members, though it is already involved in the perplexity and inconsistency caused by the expensiveness of the Imperialist system, which compels its champions to cross and compromise their own main purpose by levying duties, for the sake of revenue, on English goods. The second would be the policy of the Opposition, and the flag under which it would march to attack its enemy, were its Liberal element predominant and able to direct its movements as a whole. But, instead of this, the ruling element is one, if not more anti-continental, more violent and vituperative in the expression of that sentiment than the Tories themselves, who have not gone to Washington for a Reciprocity Treaty and come back forlorn. By the ravings

of the leading Grit organ against American connection, which of course are daily scattered over the States, the door of commercial negotiation with American statesmen is being fast closed against the party. It would be easier at this moment for Sir John Macdonald to approach the American Government on the subject of reciprocity than for the lieutenants of the *Globe*.

If the leaders of the Opposition had in them Liberal or National principle as a grain of mustard seed, there would be a field on which, not only might they give battle with advantage, but it would be alike their interest and their duty to fight again and again, till they had thoroughly impressed their case upon the public mind. The British Columbian railroad, built for the purpose of annexing to the Dominion politically a Province with which it has, geographically and economically, no connection, is a purely Imperial work, undertaken solely in the interest of the Imperialist party in Great Britain and here, of whose ambition it is the most extravagant offspring. A British work it is not, for of the people in Great Britain, not one in a hundred thousand have a wish or a thought on the subject, and if they understood the project they would know that it was a part of a general policy which is at this moment taking the bread out of their mouths, and against which the coming election will see them in arms To Canada it means a great increase of an already large and growing debt, without profit or advantage of any kind. Here, then, we repeat, is the battle ground for a patriotic Opposition. But the patriotic Opposition is not less deeply committed to the Pacific Railway than the Government, though it is committed more by want of moral courage than by conviction, and has shown its consciousness of the real character of the undertaking by a halting feebleness in the prosecution of the work. The late Finance Minister has received knighthood virtually for his co-operation in the Imperialist scheme.

Thus the action of the Opposition will probably be confined to the scathing denunciation of scandals of which, when Gov-

ernment, in a community like ours, undertakes the building of railroads on a large scale, there is sure to be an abundant crop. The spotless purity of the Outs will be contrasted in glowing periods with the foul corruption of the Ins, and it will be demonstrated, to the satisfaction at least of all the faithful, that had Mr. Cauchon, for instance, presided over the contracts the sweet savour of perfect integrity would have ascended to the skies.

—In our last number it was remarked that if a general election were to take place now, N. C. as well as N. P. would exercise some influence on the result. Party has laid that great fact to heart, and the consequence is a proposal for an increase of the Currency which Commerce is requested to mark, as an instructive offspring of the party system, observing that to increase its significance it comes not from the Radical, but from the Conservative side.

We approach the subject of N. C. rather unwillingly, because we have no sympathy with the insolent attacks which have been made upon the authors of the movement. Currency is notoriously the region of theories, and there are plenty of examples to show that people may be wrong, and even extremely wrong, in their notions about it without being rogues or fools. Anything which can promise relief to the struggling farmer ought to be welcomed and considered in no selfish spirit by the rest of the community, provided that it does not involve robbery of other classes, which we are bound to suppose the N. C. men would heartily renounce. Yet we can hardly pass the question by, because not only is it burning, but the words which we used in describing the general character of the movement and recognizing its importance, seem to have been construed as an adhesion to its doctrines.

The obvious meaning of "National Currency" is a currency issued by the State, not by private banks. This is a question of financial policy, as to which there may be a difference of opinion.

We will only remark that anything placed in the hands of the Government is drawn into politics, and becomes game for the politician; and that it is therefore, as a rule, desirable to entrust to other hands, as much as possible, anything on which the life of trade and the daily bread of the people depend, though the ultimate control must of course rest with the holders of supreme power. In the United States, the tamperings of Congress with the currency for political purposes have long been keeping American trade in a constant state of trepidation, with proportionate loss to everybody, and especially to the wage-receiving class. It is assumed in those theories that the State is something above us all, thoroughly national and worthy of implicit confidence, whereas it is nothing but a party. We have heard no very great complaints of the present system. Much has been said about the case of the Consolidated Bank: it was a bad one no doubt; and though upset, to the general relief, on a point of law, in the court of commercial morality the verdict stands. But even the holders of Consolidated Bank bills are not likely to suffer anything worse than a temporary depreciation. It might be an improvement to adopt the system of the United States, which authorizes the banks to issue bills against an equal amount of government securities held by them and deposited with the government. What is certain, however, is that a measure of this kind would afford no relief to debtors, and make no great change of any kind, none at least of the kind desired by the advocates of N. C. In England, since the Bank Charter Act, new banks of issue have not been opened, so that the amount of private bank notes is now comparatively small; yet no great effects can be traced.

What is meant, however, on the present occasion, by National Currency, is evidently something more than currency issued by the nation; it is legal tender paper.

Nation after nation, almost every nation on the earth in its turn, has issued paper of this kind, and the result has invariably been the same—commercial confusion and distress, accompanied with moral depravation, immense fortunes made by

gambling knaves, impoverishment and ruin of honest men. This is not the theory of political economists; it is the unanimous statement of historians who were the faithful recorders of contemporary facts, such as Gordon in the case of the United States at the time of the Revolution, and Barante in the case of France. Gordon, so far from being prejudiced, fancied, as will be seen, that the paper money was rendered necessary by the special exigencies of the war. He says (vol. 4, p. 144), "that day week they (Congress) ordered the board of war to make a sale of certain cannon and stores in the State of Rhode Island, for *specie* only. This may be considered as a declaration act on their part against the further circulation of a paper currency. It has, indeed, ceased by common consent. Without it, the Americans could not have carried on the war to the present period. The public benefit it has been of in this instance will compensate, in the estimation of patriotic politicians, for the immense evils of which it has otherwise been the occasion. The tender laws on one hand, and depreciation on the other, rendered it the bane of society. All classes were infected. It produced a rage for speculating. The mechanic, the farmer, the lawyer, the physician, the member of congress, and even a few of the clergy, in some places were contaminated, and commercial merchants and speculators. The morals of the people were corrupted beyond anything that could have been believed prior to the event. All ties of honour, blood, gratitude, humanity and justice were dissolved. Old debts were paid in several States when its paper was more than 70 for one in hard cash; and in Virginia when at 300 for one. Brothers defrauded brothers; children parents; and parents children. Widows, orphans and others, who had lived happily on their annual interest, were impoverished by being obliged to take depreciated paper for the specie principal that had been lent; and others were frequently compelled to receive their debts in that currency from men who confessed before witnesses that the cash they borrowed saved them and their families from ruin. A person who had been supplied with specie to be paid

at Philadelphia, while the British had possession of the city, repaid it in paper at a tenth part of its value." Gordon dwells more on the moral and social than on the economical effects of depreciated currency; but everybody knows what economical effects follow from the total subversion of commercial morality and credit. How far the currency was from helping the country through the war, as Gordon imagines, any one may learn from Washington's despatches, which reveal his army destitute of powder, tents, food, clothes, leaving as it marched over the snow the track of its shoeless feet in blood, while gold gamblers revelled in Philadelphia on the rich fruits of their knavish speculations. In the late war, as everybody knows, the experiment was repeated; the same effects, depreciation, confusion, fraud, and the saturnalia of gold-gambling followed, and to these was added a labour war, produced by fluctuations in the price of commodities, and consequently in the value of wages. The good sense of the people, rising superior to the cajolery of demagogues and charlatans, pronounced for resumption, which has brought revived prosperity in its train. It is needless to transcribe the chapters of Barante's histories describing the universal wreck which the depreciation of a legal tender currency had wrought in France. It is equally needless to pile up examples of the extent to which, in different countries, depreciation has gone. Towards the end of the civil war, a hundred dollars of Confederate currency would not buy a loaf of bread. In San Domingo, a traveller was charged a hundred dollars for a cup of coffee; infuriated at the imposition, he flung down a silver quarter and told the waiter that was all he would pay; the waiter joyfully pounced on it, and went off to get the traveller his change.

But we shall be told that these instances are not in point. It is true that the proposal which we have now to consider goes far beyond them and belongs to a different class. In each of the cases we have cited, and in all the cases which have hitherto occurred, though the paper was made legal tender, it bore on it a promise to pay, and it retained a value precisely in propor-

tion to the holder's hope that this promise would be ultimately fulfilled. The only instance, we believe, known to history, in which legal tender bills long remained at par, was that of some of the States of Holland during their war of liberation against Spain; and in this case the reason why depreciation did not take place was that absolute confidence being felt in the commercial honour of the States the hope of payment in gold never declined. But the present proposal, as we understand it, is to issue a national paper currency, bearing no promise to pay, but irredeemable avowedly and for ever. The value and purchasing power are to be conferred simply by the fiat of the State. When we give a dollar bill for goods we are apt to fancy that we buy with the bill, whereas the fact is that we buy with the dollar, that is, a certain amount of gold, stamped as good and of the proper weight by the State, which the bill represents, and which the taker can have if he chooses to apply for it. In the same way when we use a cheque, that with which we buy is not the cheque but the gold to which it entitles the holder. For the bill or cheque itself, nobody would give us anything. In this little illusion, we are convinced, the whole theory of inconvertible currency has its origin. Instead of depreciating gradually, like the legal tender currency with a promise to pay, the fiat currency would, we are persuaded, be absolutely valueless from the beginning, except in so far as it might be made a compulsory tender for existing debts, to which extent it would be simply repudiation. Of subsequent debts there would be no question, for no money would be lent, nor would any goods be sold on credit from that moment. It is a pity the plan cannot be tried in Liberia or Bolivia, because one experiment would certainly be enough. Some of the advocates of N. C. appear not to be without an inkling of the fact that their currency would be worthless, since they wisely provide that it shall not be received for customs; there are others whose faith is more robust, and who would be ready to take it for customs and debts to the State generally without any limitation. It is alleged that the currency would have a value as

entitling the bearer to a certain proportion of the wealth of the country, on which the issue is based. But the wealth of the country, the bulk of it at least, belongs not to the State but to private individuals. Is the Government to make the whole of it public by a general act of confiscation? Is it to give its creditor a ticket for A's hat or B's shoes? We have little doubt that a form of fiat bill has been prepared, and we should like very much to see it. Bill we say, not dollar; there is no use in calling it a dollar any more than in calling it a horse: a dollar is a certain weight of gold. A hard-money man in the United States asked a greenbacker who canvassed him why, if the Government could make money by fiat, it troubled him for taxes; the answer of the greenbacker we have not yet heard.

The precious metals were selected in the beginning of commerce as the medium of exchange, on account of their intrinsic qualities, including their rarity, combined with their convenience for the purpose of circulation. Whether the selection was the most fortunate possible may be matter of opinion; though it is difficult to name any other substance which unites the requisite attributes as these do. But they are now the established money of the world; it is too late to think of changing, at least the change cannot be effected by the will of any one nation. The French Republicans wanted to change the chronological era and make time begin with the first year of their republic; they found themselves tugging at the root of a tree the fibres of which were entwined with all human society. Canada could not institute a new medium of exchange without cutting herself off from the commerce of the world. Perhaps there may be some who would rejoice in such excommunication. Mention has been made in the discussion of the iron money of the Spartans; the iron money of the Spartans was the device of a military utopian whose special object it was to render commercial pursuits impossible. That it was not in itself preferable to gold was quickly proved by the conduct of the Lacedemonian officers when they went abroad in com-

mand and met with opportunities of peculation. About the Carthaginian token money, which has also been cited, we know very little, but there seems no reason for believing that it bore any analogy to the proposed legal tender paper; if it did we may be pretty sure that the cunning Phœnicians used it to pay the barbarians with whom they traded and not themselves. The currency standard of the great trading communities of Greece was always remarkably high. The inconvenience which might attend the actual circulation of metals is avoided, as all know, and gold is, as it were, volatilized for the purposes of trade by a representative paper currency which does the business of the world. It is clear, however, that no substitution of one metal or substance for another as the medium of exchange could afford any relief to the debtor if the new medium were equally valuable with the old. To pay an equivalent amount of platinum would be just as onerous as to pay gold. The Silver Bill in the United States was, to the extent of the difference between silver and gold, a measure of repudiation. It really benefited only the owners of silver mines, and the members of Congress whom they had bribed to pass the Bill.

Relief is coming to the struggling farmer in a surer way. By the competition among the numerous Loan Societies the rate of interest is being rapidly reduced. On the other side of the line it is a good deal lower than it is here, and the line is not likely very long to remain a commercial barrier as it is now. By tampering with the currency not a particle of value can be created nor can a grain of honest relief be afforded to any human being. As to repudiation, it is less noxious both commercially and morally when it comes without disguise, under the plea of stern necessity, than when it comes disguised in the form of compulsory legal tender.

There are two features of the movement which command our entire sympathy. It seeks the material welfare of the people without regard for party, and it protests against the increase of the debt. On this second point we hope often to join hands with its promoters. Opportunities are not likely to be wanting

—A Political Economy Society, founded the other day at Montreal, has had the satisfaction of entering the world with *éclat*. The sensation was produced mainly by an effort of the ever-enterprising New York *Herald* to blow a brilliant bubble, and by the unveracious tales which garrulous malice poured into the ear of the *Herald's* Montreal correspondent. The Society appears to have had its origin in the anxiety caused by the state and prospects of the Province of Quebec, which, in fact, unless it can do something for itself, is not in a hopeful way. Something has been done for the moment by the good harvest, and possibly by the N. P., or rather perhaps by the impulse of self-help and self-reliance which the N. P. has called forth. But the settled feeling is one of gradual impoverishment. The government holds out hopes of encouragement to Beet Sugar which can hardly be fulfilled in any substantial way, while the demand indicates an ominous craving for State aid. The finances of the Province are in an almost desperate condition. She is an applicant for relief to the Federal Government, which she asks to buy of her the North Shore Railroad, and recourse to direct taxation begins to stare her in the face. In the City of Quebec we hear of poor people compelled to eat unclean food.

The Society announces its intention of discussing all questions affecting the policy of the country with perfect freedom, and without regard to the censorship of Knights or to anything but the interest of the Canadian people. For this it has been reviled with farcical fury and warned that it will be attacked "with all accessible weapons" including, as we know by experience, some which are not found in the hands of honour or in the armoury of civilized war. But the dagger has been a good deal blunted by being used for some thirty years upon every character, however upright and respected, the possessor of which crossed or seemed likely to cross the path of a third-rate ambition. The Prime Minister, raised to power by an overwhelming vote of the people, is daily traduced as a common felon. The return of Sir John Macdonald was, at all events, a deliverance, political and social, from a tyranny of libel.

We have surely not come so far without learning the rights and duties of citizens with regard to matters of opinion. We are all bound to render loyal obedience to constituted authorities and existing laws, but we are all at liberty, and even to the extent of our knowledge and capacity, called upon to discuss established systems and suggest needful change. Ancient institutions rested on the divine right of kings, heaven-descended or priest-anointed, or upon some other superstition which naturally shrank from the light. Modern institutions rest on the assent of public reason, and the test of that assent is free discussion. Decisive experience has shown that the modern foundation is stronger than the ancient, and that liberty of thought and speech, instead of being the promoter of violent revolution, is, in fact, its surest antidote. What constitution has been more freely debated than that of the United States or is more rooted in the attachment of the people? For what constitution were greater sacrifices ever made than were made for this in the Civil War? That people who frankly advocate change must be bent on bringing it about by violence or intrigue, is not only not true but precisely the reverse of truth. Under a despotism everybody is tongue-tied, and everybody conspires. That the commercial policy of Canada must be discussed nobody will deny, and it is impossible to discuss her commercial policy to any purpose without taking into consideration her external relations, actual and prospective—trying, in a word, to forecast her destiny. The policy which is being pursued by the present government in extending the Pacific Railroad to British Columbia assumes at every step the truth of a hypothesis as to the ultimate destiny of the country which very few men in private maintain, which some men, who affect to maintain it in public, in private very frankly discard. In the debate on this point, the Canadian press of all shades of opinion, has on the whole been faithful to liberty, though the traces of a long reign of literary terror have not disappeared. The results of Liberal effort would not be very grand if the prejudices and the interests of any self-constituted censorship

were to be the rule and the limit of our debate on the subjects most deeply concerning the public welfare. Whenever one of these ridiculous attempts to gag a nation is made we are sure to be told, with more or less distinctness, that some commercial enterprise requiring British capital is on foot, and that Canadians must hold their peace about their own destinies for fear of frightening away the birds. Let people play their commercial game and call it loyalty if they please; but they will not be allowed, for their selfish ends, to prevent the consideration of any policy which may seem likely to bring wealth, happiness, and the virtue which is their attendant, into the homes of the Canadian people.

A journal which is sometimes pleased to style itself Liberal has received some damaging rebukes from its Conservative brethren, who, feeling their loyalty more above suspicion than that of politicians who once banqueted under the portrait of Lyon Mackenzie, do not care to prove its fervency by flinging ordure at their neighbours. But there is no tyrant like the extinct demagogue. Liberals who voted for a change in 1878 must by this time be satisfied that they made no mistake.

Since the prodigious inflation of the affair each of the two regular parties has been trying to lay this portentous birth at the other's door. It belongs to neither of them, but to a movement which, if we mistake not, will in the end swallow them both. It has its origin in the same growth of opinion as the popular vote of September, 1878, the import of which neither of the two parties yet understand, though one of them owed to it the recovery, the other the loss, of power. By that vote the people clearly showed that they would prefer their material interest, when they saw it, or thought they saw it, to less substantial considerations. The policy of the country has hitherto been directed by sentiment; and the dominant sentiment, in possession of all the places of power and the leading organs of the press, has been able to brand everything but itself, and especially all avowals of Canadian patriotism, as treason. But the economical forces, stimulated by years of com-

mercial depression, have begun to work. The fact has dawned upon the minds of those who toil with scanty returns, and who see a vast burden of debt being gradually heaped upon them, that titles, smiles, vice-regal entertainments, the favour of London drawing-rooms, the social heaven of colonists, lavished upon the few, do not provide bread for the many. They demand that a policy shall be adopted which will give them the fruits of their labour, no matter with what sentiment it may interfere. Their hearts tell them plainly enough that no policy which promotes their material welfare can really break the natural bond of affection between them and their mother country, let knighthood and Professor Fanning fare as they may. It is nearer the truth to say this than to say that there is an increase of adherence to any definite theory of political relations, though the *Globe* has now to confess with anguish, in the face of its recent denials, that "the Separationist movement has more adherents than in 1878, more by far than in 1877 or 1876." Canada, by the lapse of generations, is passing from immigrant into native hands, and the love of country awakened in the breast of the native Canadian by Confederation, which has smouldered on in spite of the most desperate efforts to quench it, has helped to set thought free on the subject of commercial relations. But the movement in its essential character is economical, and being economical it is strong. It will show itself now at one point, now at another, with an intensity varying according to the economical conditions. To-day it is brought to a head by financial embarrassment and commercial misgiving at Quebec. To-morrow Nova Scotia may be its scene. There, the shipbuilders are reported to have been dwelling on the increased cost of shipbuilding under the new tariff, while the poor universally complain of the increased price of food and clothing. The prevalence of this pressure over sentiment is a question of time, however strong among the upper and official classes the sentiment may be. Of New Brunswick much the same thing may be said; and in Ontario itself a change would soon be produced by a bad harvest and a diminished demand for

grain in England, combined, perhaps, with the depreciation of our farm produce and our farms by the influx of grain from the North-West. The movement may be expected to go on in this fitful way, weak in organization and in ostensible adherence, yet gathering strength in public opinion from every pinch of commercial distress, and from every addition to the public debt. But it will go on; printers' thunder will not stop it, nor will panic cries of rage, which only attest its growing dimensions and show that it is an object of fear as well as of hate. The only effectual way of arresting the action of the economical forces is to board the people in a good hotel. The gradual prevalence of commercial considerations over Party and mere sentiment of every kind is the great fact of the situation, and the Canadian statesman who grasps it will presently find his feet upon the steps of power.

Slander is not seraphic even when in the next column there appears an unctuous Christmas sermon on the beauty of brotherly love. But it is more likely to make an impression, on nervous minds at all events, than transparently weak arguments. What are all the far-fetched and super-subtle reasonings in favour of an artificial system compared with the solid fact that Canada is economically a portion of this Continent, and can look ultimately for a full measure of prosperity only through free participation in its trade, its resources, and its commercial life? Does not this irresistible argument pierce the flimsy tissue of sophistry at every point? Where can be the wisdom of putting us, laboriously, and at the cost of immense sacrifices, on a track which no man of sense imagines that we can permanently pursue? We are told that the abolition of the Customs line must be followed by Annexation. Would the abolition of the Customs line between France and Spain, between Holland and Belgium, be followed by any consequences of the kind? Did the Reciprocity Treaty, which was a partial abolition of the Customs line, produce any effect whatever on political relations? If Canada is drawn politically towards the Union, it is by the identity of the people, and of all their fundamental institu-

tions in the two countries; by the interlacement of the territories and the absence of any natural boundary; and by the apparent advantages of a continental union which would give freedom of internal traffic, and immunity from war. Nothing can contend against the force of these attractions but nationality; and to kill nationality with poisoned weapons, if fair weapons would not do it, has been the special aim of those who now charge commercial unionists with plotting Annexation. The two nations are being actually fused by the constant flow of Canadian migration into the United States; and what causes that migration but the commercial atrophy to which the policy of Imperialism, extended to economical questions, condemns this country?

A manifesto in favour of Commercial Union, put forth in the *Penn Monthly*, which is the organ of a great commercial association in the United States, opens with these words—"Canada is, of all countries, the one which might render America the greatest service—the service of creating a strong and vigorous nationality on our own frontier. Our own policy would be more prudent and sensible if we had such a neighbour close at hand. Rome dates her fall from the day when, at the instance of her great bankers and traders, she destroyed her only rival in arms and commerce, and reigned with no peer on the shores of the Mediterranean." Without committing ourselves to the appositeness of the parallel, we may say that this paragraph does not threaten violent Annexation. In disclaiming any intention of taking even a peaceable initiative in that matter, the writer, we have not the slightest doubt, speaks the mind of the vast majority of his countrymen. He goes on to say that "it is not the political but the commercial relations of the two countries which call for readjustment," and to argue that the readjustment must take the form of a Customs union or Zollverein, not of partial reciprocity, such as was instituted by the defunct treaty. The principal argument urged against Reciprocity is that, while the fiscal relations of Canada with England and our general commercial policy remain what

they are, it would entail the breaking up of the tariff system of the United States, since Canada would become, like Gibraltar, an entrepot for contraband. The manifesto proceeds—

"What we need with Canada, and what both countries we believe are ready for, is such a Zollverein as Austria-Hungary and Germany are said to have recently negotiated. Let us have one Tariff, one Custom House system for the whole continent north of the Rio Grande, with a division of the receipts proportional to population. The whole relations of the two countries point to such a solution. Whether the boundary line between America or Canada is or is not one of those providential lines which Ritter and the other scientific geographers believe to have been created for national frontiers, it certainly never was created for a Custom House frontier. It is a gross absurdity which reflects on the common sense and business capacity of both countries, and will continue to do so under any arrangement except that which we propose. Both countries would save a large slice of revenue by making the seashore their only Custom House line, and would facilitate friendly personal intercourse between themselves. It would take away the chief obstacle to the free flow of American capital into Canada, and would rapidly bring the Dominion up to the industrial level of our own country. The tide of emigration would cease to flow Southward across the line; and the emigrants whom either traditional loyalty or Canadian assistance has carried thither, will not be seeking remunerative employment under the American flag.

"To the lower provinces a Zollverein would be an especial boon. It would throw open to them our vast coasting trade, which employs a greater tonnage than the whole mercantile marine of Great Britain. It would put them on a level with Maine as ship-builders, and enable them to find uninterrupted employment for their ship-yards and their lumberers. On the other hand, it would put an end to the wretched disputes about the fisheries, securing Americans the fullest rights on the banks, and Canadians the perpetual right of free access to American markets."

There may be an answer to these arguments, but, at all events, they are strictly commercial, and entirely consistent with the disclaimer of any desire to insist on a change in political rela-

tions. When a proposal of that kind comes, it will come from Canada herself; and if there are any who wish to hasten its arrival they cannot do so more effectively than by identifying the commercial with the political question, and making our people feel that their commercial interests are sacrificed to the political objects of keeping a Court at Ottawa and disturbing, in the interest of European reaction, the course of progress in the New World. When these questions are brought before us, we must deal with them, and we shall deal with them, as with all other questions, frankly and without fear; all the more so if attempts are made to gag the country. But we do not wish them to occupy more than their due space in our pages.

—Our readers are grown-up men and women, and they will not thank us for talking to them about the party struggles in the Legislature of Ontario. In the Local Legislatures, at all events, party is the merest child's play. Among the subjects proposed for deliberation in the Speech from the Throne there was not one on which Eldon might not have voted with Wilkes. Of course people may tell themselves off into teams to play a match-game for office, as they may tell themselves off into teams to play a match-game at cricket; but party, in the total absence of party questions, there can be none. The leaders of Her Majesty's Opposition have already accepted their comic *rôle*, otherwise they might put an end to a noxious farce by saying at once that they came there not to make speeches against the Government, but to do the business of the Province. Noxious we call the farce, and noxious it is. In the first place, though there are no party questions, there is plenty of party spirit, which interferes with rational deliberation. In the second place, a great deal of public time is wasted in declamation: last year a fortnight was squandered over the Address, though, on this occasion, the debate was cut short by a special providence in the person of the Speaker. In the third place, we have all the evils of party organization and

machinery, the intriguing, the wire-pulling, the place-hunting, the exclusion of useful men from all departments of the public service because they will not devote themselves to a petty leader or enlist in a senseless faction, the taking of the representation out of the hands of the people. Compared with these disadvantages, the waste of money on so many liliputian monarchies and parliaments, is really a minor consideration, though it is likely, when surpluses are exhausted and taxation increases, to be the death of the system. The feeling in favour of something cheaper, more modest, more practical, is certainly gaining ground. Those to whom the Parliament of Ontario has become dearer, since their loss of the Parliament of the Dominion, have raised the cry of local self-government. But the very thing contended for is that local self-government would gain by the change of our provincial legislature, with its mock parliamentary majesty, its mock parties, and its mock regalia, into a good working body of leading local men, clear of the influence of Dominion politics, and devoting its attention wholly to our local affairs. Local self-government is infinitely valuable, and is the basis of all sound institutions; but it is impaired when unsuitable functions are assigned to it, and when it is mixed up with the central government, from which it ought to be kept entirely distinct. The relations between Law and Equity are a subject for the highest juridical intellect, and for the best legislative power. They are not a subject for a local council, or for the men by whom local councils are led.

We speak, of course, on the assumption that Canada is a nation with a national legislature, and that the Provincial legislatures are, in the strict sense of the term, local. If Canada is merely a confederation of states, and the functions of the central government are not national, but merely federal, the case is entirely altered. Then the Dominion Parliament, instead of curtailing the authority, or diminishing the sphere of a Provincial Parliament, ought to hand over to it all those subjects of legislation, such as criminal law and procedure,

with which a strictly federal government has nothing to do. But if we were to take this line we might be plausibly accused of wishing to prepare the State of Ontario for admission into the sisterhood of the Stars and Stripes. Yet nobody proposes distinctly to take the other line. Nobody has a clear view on the subject. The present arrangement was dictated by no principle, but by the accidental necessity arising from the separatist tendencies of Quebec. Mr. D. A. O'Sullivan, in the *Manual of Government in Canada*, which he has seasonably given us, cannot help reflecting the unsettled state of the public mind. We are always told that the British Constitution was our model; that the British Constitution is our guide; that to its precedents we are to look for solutions of all our difficulties. But the British Constitution is National not Federal. On questions arising out of the Federal parts of our Constitution it can throw no light whatever. Here we must look either to Switzerland or to the United States.

Whatever may happen to the Local Legislatures, we cannot think the Lieutenant-Governorships have a long life before them. One of the poorer Provinces will probably first demand to be released of the burden, and the rest will follow suit. It might be worth while to consider this possibility before the Park of Toronto is destroyed, and a million spent on a new House of Assembly. Government House might be capable of adaptation to the purposes of the Local Legislature, and a receptacle for the archives might be built on the ground. Otherwise, in case of the abolition of the Local Governorship, the house will be left useless.

—Our Protectionists must prepare themselves for a blow, though it will be dealt indirectly, and in a distant quarter. The policy of Victoria has hitherto been strictly Protectionist; while that of her neighbour, New South Wales, has been Free Trade. The farmers in Victoria are now rising against the tariff. They have formed already more than a hundred unions

to agitate for its revision, and are pressing the Government at once to remove the duties on agricultural implements and other things in which they have a special interest. They offer on their part to give up all the duties on agricultural produce. The Government resists, and is likely to fall. It has been evident for some time that this would come. The country of the United States is a continent capable of producing almost everything in itself, and for them it has been possible, as their economists say, to enjoy at once the advantages of Protection and those of Free Trade. But in a country of limited products and small markets, Protection is an oppressive Ring, and there is sure to be an insurrection against it in the end.

New Zealand, our aspiring rival in the competition for emigrants, bids fair to become a warning to us against ambition. Readers of papers on the Colonial Question know the name of Sir Julius Vogel, a high-flying Imperialist, and a projector of grand schemes of Imperial Federation. This gentleman, who is a Jew, got into his hands some time ago the Government of New Zealand, and inaugurated a gorgeous policy, the result of which was a public debt of twenty-five millions sterling, partly balanced by assets in the shape of railways, for a population of 450,000 whites, all told. So long as the money was being spent, all went merrily in New Zealand. Having dazzled the world, and having obtained his knighthood, Sir Julius Vogel transferred himself to England, where we see he is running as the Jingo candidate for Plymouth. New Zealand has just increased her public debt by another loan of five millions, of which two millions had been forestalled, and now the Finance Minister anticipates a deficiency of £911,968 for the current year. Sir Julius Vogel is not the only gentleman of his race with a gorgeous policy, and money may be made to fly in Canada as well as in New Zealand.

Another warning comes from the Cape. Lord Carnarvon, the most estimable of noblemen, having by Divine Grace become Secretary of the Colonies, and being anxious to emulate Canadian Confederation, framed for South Africa, which he

had never seen, a confederation wholly unsuitable, as its ablest statesmen at once said, to its present needs. Mr. Froude, the historian, was sent out expressly to convince the ignorant and stiffnecked Colonists of the beneficence of the scheme, in which he had even less success than in convincing the world of the virtue and purity of King Henry VIII. The Colonial Secretary of course persisted; the Zulu war and the annexation of the Transvaal followed; torrents of blood have been shed—more, perhaps, will yet be shed—and the honour of England has been sullied; yet Confederation remains impracticable, and now Mr. Froude himself takes the stump to plead for its abandonment. Does not this read us a lesson on the danger of investing a British nobleman, merely on account of his title, with wisdom and knowledge, which he does not possess, and setting him to act as a Providence in our affairs?

—A cubit was at once added to our intellectual stature when we saw before us "The Constitution and Laws of the Canadian Academy of Arts." "The objects sought to be attained by the Canadian Academy are the encouragement of Design as applied to Painting, Sculpture, Architecture, Engraving, and Industrial Arts, and the promotion and support of Education leading to the production of beautiful and excellent work in manufactures." The means proposed are the institution of a National Gallery at the Seat of Government; the holding of Exhibitions in the principal cities of the Dominion; and the establishment of Schools of Art and Design. A National Gallery, by all means, as soon as we have a presentable collection to put in it. But not at the Seat of Government; not at that Arctic lumber-village turned into a political cockpit! It is enough that our only library is there.

The Canadian Academy is planned in the grand style. Beauty and symmetry prevail in its constitution as they will in its works. We see not only the imposing forms of forty Academicians, the counterparts of those of London and Paris, seated

in their chairs of state, but a staff of learned professors and the smiling faces of a grateful train of pensioners. The stock arguments for and against Academies are well known to all whose lot it has been to set subjects for the essays of youth and to peruse the luminous results. From that authentic source we have learned what we should never otherwise have imagined, that these institutions, though formed by celestial minds, are not always free from cliquishness, jealousy, or intrigue, and that if they often stimulate, they sometimes stunt. But we have also learned what is to be said in their favour; and every plan proposed by those who have given us the Toronto School of Art is entitled to our respectful attention. We trust that the attraction to Ottawa is not patronage, which, as reason and history alike prove, can no more create art or literature than it can create a flower. The patronage of Louis XIV. produced toadyism, that of Lorenzo sensuality, nothing more. If art has received much help from anything but genius and national taste, it has been from the emulous brotherhood of schools of artists, in which youths wrought under the eye of a master, whose smile was their best reward. It is true that when His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales praised Miss Thompson's picture in the Academy, the picture next day had to be guarded by policemen against the rush. But was it a rush of taste?

In design as applied to Industrial Arts, there is no reason why Canada should not excel, models being attainable; and the promotion of these pursuits among us will be the more desirable, if our agricultural importance is to be dwarfed by the mighty North-West. In architecture we much need a style suited to the Canadian climate, if it is not treasonable to say so, in place of imitations of buildings suited to totally different climates, with projections to give us the full benefit of the cold, and roofs of complicated structure to hold the snow. The Parliament Buildings at Ottawa and the University at Toronto offend true taste by their want of adaptation. As to the higher arts, sculpture and painting, we must consult Astrology to know their future in any nation. Sculpture seems dead. What are

Canova and Thorwaldsen in the presence of the glories of the ancient chisel? The sculptor has no longer before him the forms of the gymnasium or the drapery of ancient life. Portrait sculpture, it would seem the moderns might have; but no! portraiture, whether in marble or on canvas, seems to be vouchsafed only to those who are masters of the general art. In painting there is much more of life and hope. Turner has been the victim of rhapsody, yet in the poetry of landscape, he has really no peer, and we have painters of common life, of animals and of flowers. But in higher lines we still look back to men who wrought three or four centuries ago. The painters of the Church of Assisi, the Arena Chapel at Padua, the Campo Santo at Pisa, had a tale to tell, which the people were eager to read. Perhaps when there is again a tale to be told, the inspiration will return.

—Once more the good sense of the American people and their ingrained respect for law have carried them victorious through a trying ordeal. Victorious, but not unscathed, nor without receiving a tremendous warning. Death has knocked at the door of the Republic. Garcelon and his gang will be numbered among the obscure scoundrels whom fortune, by giving them an opportunity for doing vast mischief, has exalted to the pillory of history. Once let conspiracies like theirs succeed, let the count, conducted by inflamed and unscrupulous partisans, be allowed to supersede the election, and the source of all authority, law, order, in a Republic is destroyed; anarchy, absolute anarchy, must at once ensue. Yet the result in Maine was long doubtful, and it is a fearful fact that from the breasts of the Fusionists almost to a man, faction, in its naked iniquity, completely ousted civil duty. Only two of the men who received fraudulent certificates refused to take part in the usurpation, and the multitude was prepared to follow its ringleaders to any extremity short of civil war, if even they would have stopped there. This is the handwriting on the wall of a nation. What would have been the issue if instead of Maine the theatre had been the

Republic? It is well that this local explosion has occurred to warn the people of the Union that a mine is charged beneath the Commonwealth, which otherwise might have been fired by the Presidential Election. The plea of the conspirators was retaliation for the Louisiana outrage. There is no validity in the plea, because elections at the South are one vast outrage and most flagrantly so on the Democratic side. The negro vote is absolutely suppressed by Southern violence, while it is counted against the Union. But no doubt the defiance of legality in that calamitous contest was the beginning of woes of which the end is not yet. Redeeming features in the Maine affair were the conduct of the Judiciary and that of General Chamberlain, whose clear view of his position and temperate firmness in discharging its critical duties were the chief safeguard against civil war. Many will think that if General Grant is to be constable at the next Presidential Election, he will be able to wield the baton better in a post analogous to that of General Chamberlain, as Commander-in-Chief of the Army, than as one of the parties concerned. The blow, having missed the heart of the Republic, will recoil on the Democratic party, whose alliance with Repudiators and Socialists under the name of Fusionism, has also been placed in a glaring light.

Since we last wrote, Grant's chances for the Presidency have suddenly declined. The boom has apparently been overdone, and in the extravagant demonstration at Philadelphia, the form of the couchant wire-puller was too visible beneath the flowers. Curiously enough, Grant alone seems to have remained blind to the fact, and by taking the enthusiasm as a popular outburst, and treating the engineer with disdain, to have somewhat estranged the agencies which were working his machine. A thrill of suspicion and alarm on the subject of military usurpation has run through a portion of the people, especially the Germans, who have not come to the New World for a repetition of sabre sway. The Court party in England have evidently begun to entertain hopes of Grant as a coming king, and to make up to him accordingly. We are persuaded that no such

designs are harboured in his mind. All he wants is to get back into the White House, to smoke his cigar there among his old boon companions, and to bestow the patronage of the State as before on his partizans and friends. The same influences which re-elected him would in all probability make him President for life; and in this innovation, sinister as it must be in the eyes of a loyal Republican, there would be two redeeming features—a long respite for the nation from presidential elections, and the chance which would be afforded of forming a patriotic opposition, for which Grant's government would be sure to afford sufficient reason, and which, instead of manœuvring for the next election, might address itself to the curtailment of that vast bribery fund, the presidential patronage, and possibly even to the removal of the greatest of all political nuisances, the elective presidency itself. The wind which dies on the sails of General Grant, fills those of Sherman, strong in his financial successes, and of Blaine, whose position cannot fail to be improved by his victory in Maine. There is another man of whom we should like to be able to think as possible—General Garfield, the newly elected senator from Ohio. That he was the strongest and most original speaker in the House of Representatives, is not his highest merit; in point of integrity his record is as clear as it is possible for that of any party politician to be, and he is, in the true sense of the term, a strong man; not 'a man on horseback," but constitutional and temperate as well as firm. His election would be the best thing that could happen, and therefore he is sure not to be elected.

It will be a strong objection to Grant, if he is really bent on annexing Mexico. As President, he struggled with characteristic obstinacy and tenacity to annex San Domingo, and even carried his efforts to compass his object rather beyond the line of the constitution, though he was foiled by the wisdom of the people. That Mexico might be annexed without violence is very likely; her commerce, we may well believe, holds out its hands for a regular government. But to the United States, her accession, if she were all silver, would be a curse in disguise. A

despotism can annex and govern through a Viceroy. A Republic which annexes must incorporate, and receive the political life-blood of the new territory into her veins. The political life-blood of Mexico is of the worst kind, and she would send to Washington a quota of sharpers as bad as the carpet-baggers, or worse. The success, the very existence of a Republic, depends absolutely on the character of the citizens; on their intelligent attachment to the republican principle, and their trained aptitude for its application. Already the number of political aliens in the population of the United States bears a dangerously large proportion to that of the real Republicans. Irish, Germans, and other immigrants not yet assimilated, Negroes and Southerners whose political character was formed under Slavery, must make up something like fifty per cent. of the whole nation. In many parts of the country the political leaven is barely sufficient to republicanize the lump. Let the Woman's Righter have his way; let the suffrage be given to all the women, and the self-governing element, the element accustomed to the use of political power, will be barely one-fourth of the whole. The pyramid will then be on its apex, and unless sentimental eloquence can suspend the laws of nature, the natural result will follow. It is to be hoped that Gynomaniacs in general, and the Governor of Connecticut in particular, will take note of this, before they do what cannot be undone.

Mr. Charles O'Conor, an eminent lawyer of New York, who took a leading part in bringing the Tweed gang to justice, and has always been regarded, for his integrity and his high sense of honour, as a sort of saint in the Democratic party, is moved by what he sees to come out against the Trade of Politics. He comes out with a vengeance. "Pull down the nests and the crows will fly off," said an uncompromising destroyer of Monasteries. Mr. O'Conor proposes to make a pretty clean sweep of every institution, general and local, which can harbour the vermin, leaving barely what is necessary for government, and for the most indispensable legislation. He has been called "an American Bystander," but he

takes away the breath of his Canadian counterpart. He is with us, however, on the subject of the Elective Presidency, and sees as clearly as we do that a national conflict once in every four years for that office, and the enormous patronage now annexed to it, must bring everything that is bad in the nation to the top, and will end in a domination of scoundrels.

—Among the strange phenomena of the age is the appearance of infallibilist ecclesiastics, such as Cardinal Manning, cheek by jowl with rationalistic Liberals in popular magazines. The ecclesiastics do homage thereby, in the most emphatic manner, to the liberty of opinion against which the Papacy thunders and crusades. Cardinal Manning comes out to define the duty of the Church toward that unclean thing, modern society; in other words to determine whether Catholics, in countries which are cursed with free institutions, ought to keep aloof from politics, or to use their votes for the priest. The conclusion is that they ought to use their votes for the priest. In proportion as the civil powers of any state are under the dominion of an erroneous religion, or of a schism, or of a royal supremacy, or of any one of a long list of monsters which the Cardinal gives, ending with the Falk Laws, the Church can hold no relations with them. "But under all these there lies the commonwealth or natural society in all its domestic, social, and civil relations. With this in all the regions of its life and conditions of its welfare the Church sympathises and co-operates for the common good, and that because even toward such states as these the Church has duties, such as First, to guard and conserve all of Christian faith and morals that still remains in them; Secondly, to minimize all the evils of their legislation or government; and Thirdly, to recall them by all influences to a better condition." So Paddy be off to the poll, and vote down the Common Schools if you can. Loaded with the memories of the war against the Albigenses, of St. Bartholomew, of the massacre of the Vaudois, of the Dragonnades, of Innocent III., of Alexander VI., of Jesuitism; encumbered with

the False Decretals, with feigned miracles, and forged relics in number untold; with the blood of St. Januarius and the House of Loretto; hopelessly bound to the portentous fiction of human infallibility, the Church of Rome, driven from her haughty seclusion by despair, descends into the political arena to fight her last fight against the great organic principles of modern society, justice, liberty, and truth. Those who have compared the area of popular ignorance with that of Papal ascendency and seen how the two coincide, will not have much misgiving as to the result.

—The European "war cloud" has now become the familiar companion of the breakfast-table. In former days the cable used only to bring us facts; now it brings us rumours which, because they come in that way, people take as facts, or, at least, as having some authority and substance when they generally have none. All the Russian people have been swept away by plague, famine or diphtheria, the rest have been sent to Siberia, and the army is honeycombed with Nihilism; such is the tenor of the news cabled to feed a Russophobia which is supposed to be as strong on this side of the water as it is on the other. Suddenly we are told that Russia is massing her troops heavily on her western frontier. That, troubled at home, as, apart from all exaggeration she undoubtedly is, she will rush into a war with Germany is, in the last degree, improbable; especially as the organs of Gambetta, who controls the government of France, advise her to be quiet, and hold out to her no hope of the alliance without which an onslaught on Germany would be madness. It is evident, also, that the personal relations between the two Emperors remain unaltered, and though the German Emperor must allow his policy to be shaped, up to a certain point, by the indispensable Bismarck, he would be pretty sure to interpose his veto before it came to war. An attack on Austria would be more likely, because she is acting in concert with the English Tories for the repres-

sion of the Christian nationalities whose deliverance Russia has undertaken in the East, and in this quarter the chance of success would be as good as it would be bad in the other. Everybody beats the wooden Austrian armies, and the Slavonic portion of the motley and jarring Empire would be ready to open its arms to the invader. But at present the veto of Germany would unquestionably be put on a movement in this direction, though some day, no doubt, it will come. The Czar, who after all is master of his Empire, is in such a state of nervous decrepitude that he is not likely to decide in favour of a great war. Should he abdicate and his son succeed, it is not improbable that a concession of liberties at home might be accompanied by an adventurous policy abroad. But if Russia means war, surely it must be war with England, who may be almost said to have struck the first blow by invading what has hitherto been the neutral ground between the two Empires in the East. It is surmised that, besides the weak army which was repulsed by the Turcomans, Russia has another and a stronger one on the ground, and that it would be found somewhere in the neighbourhood of Herat, if the English should push forward to that point. We shall soon know what is to come, and whether we are to expect the pleasure of a visit from Russian cruisers in these seas, for if Russia feels that she has strength enough to cross the path of her deadly foe, and if her ruler has the nerve to cast the die, this evidently is her time.

"Heavy firing" may be said to be the general result of the pacification of the Balkan communities by the Treaty of Berlin. Turks are fighting Montenegrins, Albanians are still in arms, the Greek boundary question remains as difficult and angry as ever. The destinies of these people have been settled without their consent, and with little regard for their claims and interests, according to the convenience of the Great Powers, much as those of the minor States were by the Congress of Vienna. Hence a want of grateful acquiescence which diplomacy cannot understand. Turkey, on whose national independence, territorial integrity, and capacity for self-reform the whole Berlin

policy is built, persists in shewing the world that corpses, though never so assiduously galvanized, will rot. An incident has also occurred which must be very gratifying to those who, like Mr. Cowen, upheld Islam on account of its tolerance, which they contrasted with the intolerance of Christendom. A Turkish doctor has been condemned to death for taking part in a translation of the Bible, and saved by the interposition of the British Ambassador. Islam offers you conversion, tribute, or the sword. It is well satisfied if you choose the payment of tribute, that is to say if you become its slave, and place your person, your wife and daughters, and your property at its disposal. It wants you to become a Mohammedan as little as a Cuban slave-owner wants his black slaves to become white. This is its boasted tolerance, and Christianity, when she is herself, and not a pensioned handmaid of the State and a tool of State policy, need hardly shrink from a comparison.

—Now comes the meeting of the English Parliament. The Liberals will settle their leadership and take their stand before the nation. A good stand they have not yet taken. In truth, nothing could be weaker or more compromising than their course in Parliament, though out of doors the morality of their cause has been powerfully presented to the people by their real chief. Their councils in the House of Commons have been too much swayed, under the ostensible leadership of Lord Hartington, by legal tacticians whose wisdom is but folly where moral questions are at issue. The true liberal policy—the policy which accorded with all the great traditions of the party—was one of sympathy with the struggling nationalities of the East, the heirs of the future, who, if England had stepped forth as their patroness, instead of appearing as their jealous and selfish opponent, might have been linked to her by the strongest bond of gratitude, and have formed a bulwark of her interests in the Eastern Mediterranean incomparably firmer than the reluctant and wavering subserviency of the decrepid Turk. Such

a policy appealed at once to wisdom and to sentiment; but the Liberals in Parliament never gave it distinct expression. When the Government asked for a credit of six millions to lend weight to the national diplomacy, instead of raising paltry objections on financial grounds, which could only produce the impression of indifference to the national honour, the Opposition ought to have said, "Take your six millions, or sixteen; we will withhold from the Responsible Government of the day nothing which it deems necessary to maintain the position of the nation in the Councils of Europe; but we will annex to the grant the condition that it shall not be employed for the purpose of keeping any oppressed nationality under the Turkish yoke." There, are, it is true, in the Liberal ranks a few Turks, whose votes would have been lost; but to take up an equivocal position for the sake of keeping two or three stragglers, when you are before the great court of public opinion, is poor strategy, indeed.

It is idle to speculate about the time of the general election. The question will be decided mainly by the personal interest of Lord Beaconsfield, which will counsel him to let the Parliament run out, and then retire from the Premiership, rather than dissolve and go to the country, unless he is sure of a triumph. Sure of a triumph he is very far from being. There is now in England a large amount of unfixed opinion that shifts from side to side with every turn in the diplomatic game; with every vicissitude of the war in Afghanistan; with every rise and fall in the state and prospects of English trade; and no one, with real experience, will pretend now to forecast the result of a general election in August. But at present the omens are against the Government. The *Times*, which is now thoroughly Ministerial, struggles to represent the Sheffield election as a moral victory for the Tories. But it sets Mr. Roebuck down as a Liberal. Mr. Roebuck, in his hot youth, was a Liberal and a good deal more; but like other men whose Liberalism is not settled conviction but passion, impulse, or personal ambition, he turned Tory in his old age, and was

made a Privy Councillor by the Tory Government before he died. He was a Jingo of the Jingoes, and shocked even his own friends in the House by saying, when an appeal for mercy had been made on behalf of some native race, that the first business of the settler was to exterminate the wild beasts, and that the most noxious of all wild beasts was the wild man. At the last election he beat his Liberal opponent, Mr. Chamberlain, now member for Birmingham, and one of the leaders of the party, by three thousand votes; Mr. Mundella, the other Liberal, keeping his seat only by his strong personal hold on the working classes. The election of a man holding the same opinions as Mr. Chamberlain, in Mr. Roebuck's place, is therefore clearly a Liberal gain, and if the Government does not feel itself stronger at other places than it is at Sheffield, there is little chance of dissolution, glad as the Chancellor of the Exchequer would no doubt be to put off his Budget till after the election. We may, at all events, safely postpone to our next number our survey of the position and relative strength of the two parties.

There is another thing to be corrected in the *Times*. It says that Mr. Roebuck lost his seat for Sheffield in 1868 by his bold denunciation of union outrages. But the union to which the murderers Hallam and Crooks belonged, and which had committed the outrages, like everything else that was violent and rowdy, voted for Mr. Roebuck, while the respectable unions, which abhorred the doings of Hallam and Crooks as heartily as any nobleman in the land, voted for Mr. Mundella, a master manufacturer, who had been a leading promoter of peaceful arbitration. The rowdies in England are Tory and Jingo to a man. The respectable and intelligent working men are for the most part Liberals, and to swamp them with rowdyism was the object of the Tory Reform Bill of 1867.

—A gallant defence, and one which has awakened generous sympathies in England herself, has been made by the Afghan clans. But their meed will hardly be more than a bright page,

or part of a bright page, in the annals of freedom. The Martini-Henri and the Gatling prevail. In the last invasion the invaders had only the Brown Bess, which was not much superior to the rude native gun of the patriot. Military invention has many a time decided, not only the fate of battles, but the course of history. Gunpowder is a hackneyed instance. The long-bow with which the peasant swept a mounted aristocracy from famous fields is hardly less familiar. But the successive improvements of firearms, the introduction of the bayonet, and even of the ring in place of the plug bayonet, have been far-reaching in their political and social, as well as in their military, effects. If we carry back our scrutiny to the history of the ancient communities, we shall find the same influences prevailing. Arms of precision now place the Eastern Civilizations at the mercy of the filibuster, to the great loss of Humanity; for China and the other destined victims of aggression will not have time to supply themselves before the filibuster is upon them. On the other hand, it seems to be proved that the defenders of national independence, where they possess these weapons, will be better able than before to cope with the drilled masses of the invader: to storm an earthwork manned by resolute though undisciplined men, with good breach-loaders, is evidently a serious undertaking for discipline herself. It is at sea that the domination of great and wealthy powers over those who have less money to spend in engines of war seems likely to be most complete. Any inventor who could devise the means of neutralizing the omnipotence of iron-clads would be a deliverer as beneficent as the destroyers of the Armada. To judge by the present aspect of the moral sky, humanity is likely in the coming years to owe immunity from a reign of rampant wrong-doing more to material auxiliaries than to ethical restraints. From the fact that the mass of the Afghans have been found unprovided with rifles, we should be led, as we said before, to infer that Russia was not behind them in this war: it is at least enough to make us suspend our judgment as to the effect of mysterious and compromising documents

till the documents are produced. When the powder magazine at Cabul was blown up, forthwith the report flew abroad that the Cabulese had been taught to do it by Russian artillerymen; as though a Cabulese artilleryman did not know how to apply a match to powder. No doubt while the two antagonists were facing each other at Constantinople, with swords half drawn, the diplomacy of each was active in providing allies both at Cabul and elsewhere. But when you enter the country of a race of gallant mountaineers, impose on them a foreign government, and plunder and burn their villages, is foreign intrigue needed to cajole them into striking for freedom? Was it foreign intrigue that sent forth the Swiss to Granson and Morat or brought the Tyrolese to the standard of Hofer?

It would be unfair, perhaps, to blame General Roberts, still more to blame those under his command, for the cruelties which he is committing in Afghanistan. He was sent not to observe the laws of humanity, but to take "a vengeance which would ring through Asia." He has, of course, established martial law, that is, organized disregard of all securities for justice, and is carrrying on a reign of terror. A correspondent of the *Pioneer*, the official journal of India, writing from Cabul, says: "Nothing can be more quiet than this city which has been so notorious for bloodshed and turbulence; the shadow of the scaffold is over it. They have hitherto traded upon our known weakness—the quality of mercy; and it is only now that they understand the new principle of retribution we have introduced into our policy. Like Pollock, General Roberts might have destroyed their bazaar and left Cabul to its fate; but whether we withdraw again or not, there will be the tale of lives taken by our hangman to be counted over in the city and villages; and who knows yet what powerful names may top the list." Nothing could present more vividly the inevitable progress of the conqueror's character from that of the ordinary aggressor into that of the demon than the words, "They have hitherto traded upon our known weakness; and it is only now that they understand the new principle of retribution we

have introduced into our policy." The Englishman in India may in time match the Spaniard in Mexico.

It may be thought that the executions were confined to those convicted or suspected of complicity in the attack on the Embassy. Not so. The crime for which forty-one Afghan soldiers were hanged was simply that of having stood in a fair fight for their country against the invader at Charasiab. They were not even taken in battle; they were refugees hunted up afterwards in the villages. They were marched into Cabul and brought before a military commission. The only evidence of their identity was the muster roll of their regiment, so that, had they chosen to give false names, identification would have been difficult. But every one of them gave his right name. They were turned off ten at a time and met their fate with perfect fortitude. The crime with which they were charged was rebellion: but if they could even have formally owed any allegiance to a parricidal usurper, set up as a tool of the foreigner, that allegiance ended when the usurper was in turn dethroned by those who had set him up and became a prisoner, with sentence of death hanging over him, in their hands. To appeal once more from our judgment in our own case to our judgment in the case of others, suppose we had found all this in a history of the Spanish conquest of Mexico, what would have been the verdict? Yet State Bishops in England say that they vote for the Afghan war because it promotes "spiritual objects." Fancy missionaries preaching "under the shadow of the scaffold" at Cabul a religion of love and mercy, a religion which bids you turn the other cheek to the smiter, and forgive your offending brother not seven times, but seventy times seven!

Nothing in history is more repulsive than the hypocrisies of conquest; nothing is so demoralizing to the conqueror. Frankly to unfurl the black flag is better than to wrest to the purposes of piracy the principles of right and law. Afghan patriots are put to death for "rebellion" against a prince who is not only a puppet of the foreigner, but a prisoner in the foreigner's hands.

The annexation of the Transvaal was an act of violence for which no pretence of legal right was ever put forward; the motive here, as in the Zulu war, being to round off the territory of the projected South African Confederation. The Boers had gone out to make their own home in the wilderness, and had as perfect a right to that home as the English people have to theirs. But Boer leaders who have protested against the robbery are now arrested and, we presume, will be tried for "treason." If they are put to death it is judicial murder.

Nine-tenths of a nation's history are character; and the great events are those by which character is critically affected. Plainly enough such events are taking place in England now. We read the other day, in the leading English journal, an elaborate editorial debating what was to be done with the Afghans. The question of expediency was treated in all its phases, but of morality there was absolutely no mention; so far as that was concerned the article might have appeared in an organ of Timour or Genghis Khan. It happened that at that very time the proprietor of the paper was presiding over a religious meeting and lecturing the Christian clergy on their duties. The *Standard*, the great organ of the party which upholds the Establishment, lays it down as a maxim that the possession of India gives England a right of way to it, and that if anything is necessary to the security of that right, she must take it, no matter whose property it may be. "Whether this be morality or not," says the *Standard*, "we need not stop to argue: it is politics." Burke said that nothing which was morally wrong could be politically right; but in the days of Burke, Warren Hastings was impeached with the concurrence of Pitt; in these days he would receive an ovation.

—Mr. Parnell has preached to the Ireland of the dispersion, which, upon the whole, has responded with enthusiasm. The undying love of the Irish in all quarters of the globe for Erin, the passionate sympathy with which they follow her sad fortunes, and the generosity, be it well-advised or ill-advised,

with which they come to her aid, are enough to cover many a defect and confute many a harsh saying. But clearness of aim is not the Hibernian forte, and it is difficult to understand whether Mr. Parnell is asking for bread or gunpowder. Irishmen are ready enough to give him both; perhaps they would rather give gunpowder than bread. But the Americans are less ready to subscribe to insurrection than they were before their civil war, and they have no notion of an anti-rent movement. On the question of property they are ultra-Conservative, showing thereby that it is not a Court that makes Conservativism, but contentment. The so-called anti-rent movement in New York was nothing but a rising against obsolete dues and services, which vexed the holders of land on the old Van Rennselaer estate.

In Ireland, meantime, famine advances, and sedition with it; starving men are not apt to be loyal to the system. Irish landlords write in the papers to the old tune. They say it is not their fault; that they behave like fathers to their tenantry; that a good tenant is never ejected. There is a great deal of truth in their plea, and as a class they deserve far more sympathy than reprobation. It is undeniable that Lord Leitrim provoked his murderers by a tyrannical use of his legal rights; that he was not the only harsh landlord in Ireland; and that the number of absentees, whose estates are managed by agents, is large. But, on the whole, the Irish landlords of the present day are suffering, not for their own sins but for the sins of their predecessors. It is too true, also, that the peasantry are thriftless, and that they multiply recklessly. But what makes them do so? The common explanation is that they are Celts. But the French peasantry are Celts, and yet they are the thriftiest people in the world, and those who most narrowly restrict the increase of population. Even the intemperance of the Irish is, to a great extent, an intemperance of misery; it wears off in kinder lands.

What will be the result in Ireland itself? It is very likely that the agrarian part of the movement may attain some

measure of success, because the mass of the English people care nothing for the Irish landlords, and would willingly see their estates divided among the peasantry to-morrow, if that would settle the Irish question. But the English people care a great deal for the Union, with good reason; and the National aspirations of the Irish would encounter a far more serious resistance. By a perfectly united nation, thoroughly in earnest and well led, even a power which seems overwhelming may sometimes be overcome. But Ireland is very far from being perfectly united; the leaders of society generally are British in sympathy; while in the North there is a population alien and hostile to the Celt, which has more than once shown itself nearly a match for all the rest of the Island. And now it is evident that the hierarchy and all but the most national of the clergy, satisfied with having achieved Disestablishment, have severed their cause from that of the people, and yielded to the reactionary bias of their order. This, it is true in one respect, helps the patriots, since it enables them to cast in their lot with other oppressed nationalities, whereas they have heretofore been in the false and somewhat scandalous position of crusading, at Papal bidding, against the Italian struggle for independence, while they were calling upon the world to sympathize with their own. If the Liberal party in the English Parliament were timid in supporting Italy, it was because they were afraid of alienating their Irish wing. But the masses cannot succeed in any movement without leaders, and the only leaders the Irish masses had were their priests. It is almost certain that a large extension of local self-government will be proposed by the Liberals if they return to power. The Central Parliament is overwhelmed, and the wheels of legislation are clogged by a mass of business, much of which might well be delegated to local councils, subject to the supreme authority. In this way, Ireland may obtain a measure of Home Rule; and her division into four Provinces lends itself aptly to such an arrangement. Irish Nationality we are not likely to see.

It is easy to sympathize with the aspirations of an Irishman who wishes to see a Parliament on College Green, though the only Parliament that ever sat there was a sink of political villainy. No doubt Ireland would be far happier if she were an island by herself in the Atlantic Ocean with a government of her own. But she lies under the guns of England. To part in peace after all that has taken place would be impossible; severance would be mutual enmity, and the weaker island would be able to escape reconquest, and a second train of calamities, only by becoming the vassal of some protecting power. Rebellion appears utterly hopeless. The only rational alternative is cordial union with the Liberal party in the English Parliament for the purpose of obtaining as large measures of relief as possible, both in the matter of land tenure and in that of Home Rule. But first of all the priest must be taught to confine himself to his own sphere; till that is done, there is no political hope for Ireland.

With famine stalking and sedition burning through one of her own Kingdoms, Great Britain is spending her resources and energies in the subjugation of tribes in Central Asia. This, surely, is either the height of statesmanship or the depth of folly. When the people of Spain were starving and in rags, when Spain was losing her hold over her own peninsula, Portugal having broken away from her, and Catalonia being in a state of chronic rebellion, flashy adventurers, like Alberoni, were still appealing too successfully to the insane desires of her people for empire over distant countries, and leading her into a policy of dreams. England is not a Spain, but she may make herself a Spain if she prefers filibustering to honest industry. For the wealthiest nation in the world to be accepting alms from other countries for her suffering poor is hardly true dignity: there would be more dignity, though less brilliancy, in devoting to that purpose the fund which is now being spent upon the Afghan war.

—In France, from Waddington to De Freycinet is a step toward the Left; but not a very wide one, for the ex-Premier was asked to remain in the Cabinet, though he declined. De Freycinet is deemed superior as a Parliamentary tactician and as a speaker to Waddington, who is a poor speaker with a weak voice, a serious disadvantage in that vast cave of the political winds. But no mere turn of the kaleidoscope either way will put an end to the difficulties which beset Parliamentary government, the violent sectionalism of the Chamber, and the temper of the Republicans, who seem to have lost in victory the self-control which they showed to an unexpected extent in the hour of danger, and do their best to drive the Government on the rocks by inexorably demanding the dismissal of all state officers, high or low, in the least degree open to the suspicion of disaffection to the party. Official is an improvement on personal decapitation; and the French aptitude for constitutional government generally may be said to have improved in about the same ratio, but it is still very far from being perfect. Reliance on the good effects of time and discussion has evidently not yet found a place in the French mind; if the suspected office-holders were let alone, nine-tenths of them would most likely be converted or become harmless. Besides being a little less Conservative than Waddington, De Freycinet is more distinctly a warming-pan for Gambetta. The time cannot be far off when Gambetta will have to take out his last warming-pan and be Minister himself. He has reckoned on having the awkward things, such as the recall of the Communists, done for him by deputy, and at the same time by the failure of all other leaders, proving himself the indispensable man. But his own popularity has, apparently from some mistakes of manner, been somewhat impaired of late. It is said that he has been studying the science of war. Whether he has or not, and whether he brings with him a war policy or not, there is the enormous army, with the life of the Republic absolutely at its mercy, and spreading military sentiment through the country. The people seem to have thoroughly accepted the Republic; but

while the nation remains organized as a military empire a military emperor will be always at the door.

In Italy even more than in France the Liberal Government has been tossed on the short, chopping waves of a multitude of political sections, and the result has been a new political invention, something like the double ship devised to carry people smoothly over the waters of the English Channel. A Ministry called the Cairoli-Depretis, has been constructed, with two leaders, in the hope of combining the support of two or more of the sections. A smooth passage, however, seems not to have been obtained. Some day the political architects of Europe will discover the absurdity of reproducing as a universal constitution, the combination of historical accidents and hypocrisies called British Party Government, and they will have recourse to that which alone can assure adequate support and lend stability to a Government, the regular election of the Executive Council for a fixed term by the Legislative Assembly. The Liberals are likely to feel the necessity first because their party, being a party of opinion, is more liable to sectionalism than the reactionary party, which is generally a party of interest.

—It was said that Books would be noticed if they were events in the history of opinion.

That the moral faith of the masses of mankind at least has hitherto rested on the authority with which conscience was invested by religion, nobody who knows the history of opinion will deny. A collapse of religious belief, therefore, is likely to be followed by a break-up of popular morality, whether the morality of the *élite* be affected or not. Nobody sees this more clearly than Anti-theists (to use a term at once distinct and courteous), such as Renan and Taine, who for the purpose of securing the social order which is conducive to their comfort, propose a concordat with the priests. This would be jesuitism, and like all jesuitism weak as well as wicked. Mr. Herbert Spencer takes a better and wiser course. He tries in his "Data of

Ethics," to place morality on a scientific basis. Morality we ought hardly to say, for in the ordinary sense of the term it vanishes. He entirely excludes the existence of any moral law, of any moral ideal, of conscience, except as accumulated and inherited opinion, tinged with mysterious authority by the shadow of human coercion. He draws no decisive line between the ethics of the oyster and those of man. The only difference is that the conduct of the highest of mammals is more evolved and more exactly adjusted to an end.

The end is not the realization of any ideal of character, but simply the preservation of life—of life as intense as possible and with the utmost possible amount of pleasure. According as they are adjusted to this, human actions are good or bad; other test or criterion there is none. Ethics are treated successively in their physical, biological, psychological, and social aspect; but Mr. Spencer's philosophy is fundamentally mechanical. "Moving equilibrium is ethical perfection." "A greater coherence among its component motions, broadly distinguishes the conduct we call moral from the conduct we call immoral." We may remark by the way, that the theories of motion upon which Mr. Spencer's philosophy is built, are regarded as very questionable by some of the highest authorities on that special subject. If they are not more in accordance with the facts than his statements about history in general, and the history of religion in particular, the foundation of his imposing edifice is far from sound. His account of mechanical formation and progress, through moving equilibrium to disintegration, has absolutely nothing, so far as we can see, corresponding to it in the real annals of nations.

That the "Data of Ethics" contains much that is very intructive, especially in the shape of criticism on previous theories, all will admit, as well as that it bears the invaluable impress of honest inquiry. But suppose it to be the truth, so far as physiology is concerned; suppose it to give a real account of the genesis of coherent conduct in the highest of the mammals; may there not still be something beyond coherent conduct and

beyond the mammal? Did the upward progress, the ascent of man, stop when it ceased to be cognizable by physiology as evolution? Are the phenomena which in their human aspect we call moral, in their apprehended relation to the Unseen spiritual, worthy of no notice whatever? Has not man, as a matter of fact, now before him a moral ideal towards which he bends his endeavours, let its genesis be what you will. There is proof in Mr. Spencer's pages that he has given his mind more to physiology than to history or philosophy—to the study of the human organism more than to the study of man. Yet even in his pages there are inklings of something for which the philosophy does not account: there are outbursts of burning indignation against wickedness and the wicked—against Jingoes and their political burglaries; against Fifeshire militiamen who, so long as they are sent to war are ready to fight on either side; against Christian Bishops who lend their sanction to invasions of Afghanistan. But if his philosophy is true, might not the Jingo or the Fifeshire militiaman or the war-preaching Bishop reply: "Your indignation is unscientific? By the operation of the great mechanical law which you have so luminously expounded, I have been brought to a certain point of evolution; that it is not a higher point is no fault of mine, I am far below you, it may be, but still I am above a scorpion or a tiger. My conduct is adjusted to my own ends, what more does your theory require?" Under Mr. Spencer's language in these passages there seems to us to lurk the admission that man is not merely a highly-evolved mammal, but a being that owes allegiance to a moral ideal, and that conscience, whatever its origin, has now an authority of its own. Even his habitual use of the terms "higher" and "lower" is suggestive of some criterion, different from mere complexity of organization. If Religion and Science are ever reconciled, it will not be by any reversal or curtailment of the conquests of science, but by our finding that beyond her domain there are still real phenomena to be examined. Religion need not shrink from accepting the doctrine that the supreme end of action is life, and the test, pleasure, provided it is not

assumed that the life is only this life or that the pleasure must be enjoyed here. The dawn of a religion in harmony with Science is faintly visible even in Mr. Spencer's book. After observing that conflicting ethical theories severally embody portions of the truth, he proceeds: "The theological theory contains part. If for the divine will, supposed to be supernaturally revealed, we substitute the naturally revealed end towards which the Power manifested throughout Evolution works; then, since Evolution has been and is still working towards the highest life, it follows that conforming to those principles by which the highest life is achieved is furthering that end. The doctrine that perfection or excellence of nature should be the object of pursuit is in one sense true; for it tacitly recognises that ideal form of being which the highest life implies and to which Evolution tends." For "Power" read "God," as we may, without any essential change, and this is Natural Theology. It is even Christianity, if we may conceive that one way in which the Power has manifested itself is by presenting a moral ideal as the mark of human effort. And Mr. Spencer himself says that, "a rationalized version of the ethical principles of the current (Christian) creed may ultimately be acted on;" though it hardly consists with certain theories about the evolution of the Sciences that the true principles of the crowning Science of Ethics should have been discovered in a wholly unscientific age by a peasant of Galilee.

That Mr. Spencer's own morality is high, both his writings and his action sprove. That he has supplied the needed prop for the morality of the world at this perilous crisis, we must confess ourselves unable to believe. He looks forward to a millennium of social perfection, to be brought about by the progress of Evolution in a million of years perhaps, if the planet lasts so long. This may serve his scientific imagination in place of a Future Life. The unscientific and unimaginative will hardly sacrifice the lust of the hour to a remote vision, which after all, if it is ordained by Evolution, they may leave Evolution to bring to pass.

—Another event in the history of opinion is the success of Canon Farrar's "Life and Works of St. Paul." Its popularity, like that of his former work, shows the intense interest which, in spite of all those doubts and perplexities, is still felt in Theology generally, and the special craving for a more intimate knowledge of the founders of our religion. That craving is not to be satisfied by heaping up topographical and archæological details, interesting in their way as these may be. How much should we learn about the character of Bismarck from a minute description of the streets and customs of Berlin? The figure which we strive to realize mocks our longing gaze and recedes still farther into the mist. But the most significant feature in Canon Farrar's book and its reception, is the constant and manifest struggling of this dignitary of the Church of England to get rid of miracle. Under a cloud of that mystical and somewhat rhapsodical rhetoric of which he is rather too great a master, he reduces the vision of St. Paul to a natural occurrence—the effect of high spiritual excitement combined with a burst of thunder, a vivid gleam of lightning, or some blinding, suffocating, maddening breath of the sirocco. And then he asks—"Is the essential miracle rendered less miraculous by a questioning of that objectivity to which the language seems decidedly to point?" Most assuredly it is; and the question at once discloses the state of the writer's mind on the subject. What is "objectivity" but reality; and what are miracles if they are not real? "Are the eye and the ear," asks Canon Farrar, "the only organs by which definite certainties can be conveyed to the human soul? Are not rather these organs the poorest, the weakest, the most likely to be deceived?" To what do all the miracles in the New Testament appeal, if not to the eye and to the ear? Again, who reading the passage in the Acts (xx. 9) can doubt that its plain meaning is that Eutychus was killed by his fall and restored to life by miracle? But this is Canon Farrar's gloss—"It was dark, and the poor lad lay senseless, and was 'taken up dead.' A cry of horror and wailing rose from the bystanders; but Paul, going down stairs,

fell on him, and clasping his arms round him said, "Do not be alarmed, for his life is in him." *After he had calmed the excitement by this remark, he left the lad to the effects of rest and quiet, and the kindly care, perhaps, of the deaconesses and other women who were present;* for the narrative simply adds that the Apostle went up-stairs again, and after "breaking the bread"—words descriptive, perhaps, of the Eucharistic consecration—and making a meal, which describes the subsequent Agape, he continued in friendly intercourse with the congregation till the dawn of day, and then went out. *By that time Eutychus had fully recovered.* "They led the boy alive"—apparently into the upper chamber—"and were not a little comforted." It may truly be said that an equivocation such as is here ascribed to the writer of the Acts would be more destructive of our confidence than a detected fiction.

An analogous mode of treatment is applied to the Miracle of the Gift of Tongues on the Day of Pentecost, which, in Canon Farrar's estimation, is thus brought "into strict accordance with the known laws of psychology," and after undergoing this process is to furnish a fresh proof of the truthfulness of the history. So it may appear to Canon Farrar, but others will think that a history so worded as to make all readers for eighteen centuries believe that there was a miracle when there was none, would deserve the praise of ingenuity rather than of truthfulness. The same tendency is visible in Canon Farrar's "Life of Christ;" notably in the strange, and more than strange, version of the Miracle of the Devils cast into the herd of Swine.

The world of opinion is being rapidly divided by a pretty distinct line into Theists and Spiritualists on one side, Antitheists and Materialists on the other. But the Theist and Spiritualist section is again divided in itself. On one hand, there is a large body of Supernaturalists, who, in different churches and with many varieties of specific creed, still maintain their faith in Miracle and Dogma. On the other hand,

there are not a few who, having accepted the results of science and criticism, find themselves compelled to relinquish the Supernatural, yet cling to Natural Religion and to Christianity in its natural aspect. With these last the day at present goes hard. On one side they are denounced by Orthodoxy, which brands them as unbelievers, and points to their perplexities as the condign punishment of their apostacy; on the other hand, they are derided by Materialism, assured of the correctness of its sudden conclusions, and without mercy for hesitation. Under this double fire they have to reconstruct their evidences, and to present the Theistic hypothesis anew to themselves and to the world. Yet among them are many men of high education, and not a few eminent in physical science. The religious instinct, by faith in which they are sustained, is evidently not only unextinguished, but still strong in the mass of men. To say that they will certainly and totally fail seems at present a little premature. The disarray of Orthodoxy apparently is hopeless; but it may yet turn out that Materialism also has been rather too cock-sure.

THE BYSTANDER.

MARCH, 1880.

TWO assemblies, styled deliberative, have met, one in Canada, the other in England—

> " They *meet* in clouds of smoke and dust,
> With sword sway and with lance's thrust,
> And such a yell is there—"

Whether it is better to plant the blow on your opponent's ribs, or between his eyes, is the chief subject of "deliberation." In England, however, the battle is about great questions, the decision of which may settle the destiny of the nation. Here there are great questions of a certain kind, but on these both the armies are on the same side. Tory and Grit are equally Anti-Nationalist: in truth, the Grit is even the more Anti-Nationalist of the two. The chief subject to which, if there were a Liberal Opposition, its criticism would be directed, is the Railway policy, which is leading the country through financial disaster to compulsory annexation; and it is precisely on this point that the tongues of the Grit leaders are most fatally tied by their own acts as well as by their general fear of the powers of toadyism which menace with calumny any Canadian who stands up for the special interests of Canada.

The policy which lavishes the resources of Canada in building railways for the purpose of politically annexing British Columbia and Manitoba is Imperialism. The word is used in no disrespectful sense. There are many good and able men

who believe that the aggregation of boundless territories in different parts of the world, really or nominally under a single government, is the grand source of strength and happiness, while there are others who believe that more of both is to be obtained by multiplying the centres of political life. There are many good and able men who believe that it is possible and desirable to erect the straggling line of British possessions of the north of this Continent into an Empire, united in itself, antagonistic in spirit to the communities which adjoin it, identified politically with the British aristocracy, and destined to prevent the triumph of democracy on this Continent; while there are others who hold that such an undertaking is a mere fighting against the progress of humanity as well as against the physical ordinances of nature. We only mean to say that the object of the present policy is Imperial not Canadian; political not commercial. The special interest of Canada is treated as subordinate to that of the Empire; while commercial considerations are disregarded. This, right or wrong, is the plain fact.

Thirty-six millions have now been sunk in the Intercolonial Railway; no hope is held out that the road will ever pay: the utmost expected is a reduction of the outlay on it, and this, the Opposition maintains, is being brought about by a serious sacrifice of efficiency and repair. Nobody can doubt that this, at all events, is a political and military, rather than a commercial, work. The main objects were to secure a communication through British territory and a military road beyond the reach of the supposed enemy in the United States. Whenever the Intercolonial Railway is mentioned we are authoritatively informed that the suggestion came not from the Colonial office but from Canada. Knowledge of the sentiments and plans of the Colonial Office is not confined to this side of the water or to a single breast. But what does it signify whether the suggestion came from Imperialists in Downing Street or from Imperialists in Canada? It did not come from a quarter in which commercial considerations prevailed, or in which the special

interest of Canada was paramount. The Imperial Parliament gave a guarantee on the ground that the work would be beneficial to the Empire.

That for Canada to construct a railroad at a probable expense of a hundred millions for the purpose of opening a connection with British Columbia and her fifteen thousand whites can be, in a commercial point of view, anything but madness, nobody has been yet found explicitly to say. Suppose the New England States, whose aggregate wealth must be as great as ours, had undertaken by themselves to carry a railway to the Pacific Coast before the existence of San Francisco, for the purpose of connecting themselves with a place like Burrard's Inlet, what would have become of the Yankee's reputation for good sense? In this case the political aim of the enterprise is almost as little likely to be fulfilled as the commercial. It is inconceivable that geography, against which no power has yet prevailed, should so completely succumb to our Acts of Parliament as to permit this more than unnatural combination. The British Columbians themselves are frank; they do not pretend to care much for the railway as a bond of union, though they clamour for the expenditure of Dominion money in their Province. In private all the world is of one mind on this subject; and, as we have said before, it is a sinister fact that in public not one man has been found to make a resolute resistance, or indeed any resistance at all, to this desperate waste of the money of our people. Fear of being out of fashion, and being denounced by some organ of toadyism as disloyal, has prevailed in every heart over duty to the country.

With regard to the North-West Territory there is more to be said. Had the British Government, with its Hudson Bay Company charters and monopolies, as absurd as Papal grants, not stood in the way, the country would long ago have been colonized in the best manner without a cent of expense to Canada, without a violent disturbance of the value of her own agricultural products, and with all the benefits of whatever kind

which the present outlay is likely to secure. What it will be to old Canada now is the most momentous and interesting problem of the day. There are many who think that it will be her salvation: that it will give her a substance and a backbone which she could not otherwise have had; and enable her to become—a nation, perhaps, they would not say—but a permanent Confederation. These men assume that Canada will be able to engross the North Western trade. But upon what do they base that assumption? If upon convenience of transit, this, apparently, must depend upon the possibility of carrying a railroad, at a cost not utterly ruinous, to the north of Lake Superior: for a water way, frozen during five months in the year, can surely never hold its own against railway communication. If upon patriotism, their faith must be strong, and nobody can say that they are infected with the scepticism of the age. In old Canada the population is almost entirely British, and there is still a certain feeling of border antipathy to the Americans, the offspring of U. E. Loyalism and the two wars. But the settlers of the North-West are a mixed multitude, and likely to be more so as time goes on, while those who know the country assure us that there the border antipathy does not exist. At St. Paul is being formed a colony of Canadian business men, which will be a point of attraction and a connecting link. The special sentiment of the Canadian element is likely to rule for a season; but in the end commercial influences will prevail, and unless the road can be constructed round Lake Superior, they will infallibly cause the North-West to gravitate commercially towards the States immediately to the south of it, with which it is connected by nature. Signs of the tendency will probably appear before long if it is true that under the present prohibitive system the people of Manitoba are unable to provide themselves with cows and oxen. We have not yet had from any one of our public men a statesmanlike speech upon this question, deliberately attempting to forecast the future. Of blazing rhetoric about the glorious fertility of the "illimitable wilderness" we have

had enough from Prime Ministers, Governors-General, and orators of all descriptions; but what does this prove with regard to the probable relations, commercial or political, of the North-West to the Dominion?

Remarkable passages, illustrating the Military and Imperial character of the Pacific Railway, will be found in the Adjutant-General's Report on the Militia, together with a prospectus of the demands which will be made on Canada for the defence of British Columbia, and of Imperial interests in the Pacific, of which she seems destined to be the special guardian, in the event of a war with Russia. The whole document is a most instructive exposition of Imperialist policy and sentiment. It proposes to turn the husbandmen of Canada into an army and her mariners into a navy, to be incorporated with a vast Imperial armament, for the purpose of carrying on the wars of the Empire in all quarters of the globe. Of course there are to be military schools, arsenals, manufactories of rifled cannon —all in face of an annual deficit, a heavy public debt, and a burden of private debt, especially among our farmers, at least equally heavy. To these proposals is subjoined, not as equally military in its character, but as equally beneficial and practicable, one for stopping the polar current which runs through the Straits of Belle Isle.

This, it cannot be too often repeated, is the great question of the day. If a member of Parliament has not made up his mind on it, or is afraid to say what he thinks about it, he may be great in investigating scandals, but he is of little use at a perilous crisis.

—The Opposition finds a point of attack in the misdoings at the Toronto Custom House. It was apparently the duty of the Government at once to proceed criminally in accordance with the law. Instead of this, we are told that a bond has been taken and the offender has been permitted to decamp. That he had not falsified the books is a poor plea; the books of a public office are not easily falsified under the eyes

of the clerks. His character was notorious, so much so that he really has some reason to complain of those who gave him the opportunity of laying his hands on public money. But he was a political wirepuller and knew the secrets of his party, the heads of which were compelled to pay him with an appointment, and now dare not proceed against him. Meantime Mr. Jarvis, a Post-office clerk, suspected of having stolen money from a letter, is taken through the streets handcuffed before his trial and locked up in a felon's cell, though when he is brought to trial it turns out that there is no evidence of his guilt. The Toronto Post Office appointment was another instance of the evil hold which the underlings of party obtain over its leaders, and which in that case caused the claims of the public service and the just rules of promotion to be utterly set aside. No doubt the leaders loathe the degrading necessity to which they bow; but so it will be while the party system lasts.

We have also had revealed a system of organized roguery in relation to public contracts. That this has been generated in the atmosphere diffused by the present Ministry is a fond fancy of the Grits, who imagine that no political air can be pure without their Cauchon. But it is connected clearly enough with the trade of politics; so much we might have taken for granted, even if a government organist had not appeared as a partaker in the corrupt gains. In this case again, the Government will shrink from dealing with the offenders and put off public justice with securities real or imaginary for the future. And this sort of work is pretty sure to have been going on in the North West on the largest scale. That it opens a wide door for corruption is an evil of the North-Western policy in gravity second only to the expense. We welcome the accession of Mr. Macpherson to the Cabinet, in the hope that his vigilance may support the virtue of the Department of Public Works.

—We are promised a discussion, though not in definite terms a measure, on the Banks and Currency. There are one or

two things which, it is to be hoped, will be borne in mind. In any question between the action of the Government and that of commercial institutions it is usually assumed that while the commercial institutions represent private interest and an inferior morality, the Government represents purity and the nation; and the inference is naturally drawn that the more the action of the Government can be enlarged, the better conducted we shall be. Unhappily this assumption is not borne out by facts; in communities such as ours the commercial element is sounder than the political; we may say that upon the whole it is much sounder, and our opinion will be supported by the incidents to which we have just referred. Commerce, if the laws regulating its operation are even tolerably wise, is likely to do better for us by itself than with the frequent assistance of politicians. It, at all events, suffers for its offences, in credit and ultimately in cash, whereas the politician, bedeviling commerce with his legislation, suffers not at all provided he obtains the vote. Our industrial life depends on the soundness of the currency, a disposition to tamper with which for party objects has already been betrayed. The United States have lost heavily, and would have been ruined, by currency legislation, if commercial influence and the better part of the press, supported by the good name of the people, had not kept Congress under some control. Canada has not had much reason to be ashamed of the conduct of her banks, compared with that of the banks of other countries. We have had nothing like the failure of the Glasgow Bank, of the Western, or of the Agra and the Brighton in former times. The Consolidated, it is now announced, will pay billholders and depositors in full. If further safeguards are needed, let them by all means be devised; but nothing will be gained by making banking or any other branch of trade political.

Again, it is a mistake to suppose that the issuing of bank bills is essentially a part of the duty of Government. The only thing which is essentially a part of the duty of Government is stamping the coin. Bank bills are not to be classed with coin;

they are to be classed with securities or drafts for coin, such as cheques, promissory notes, and bonds. A bank bill is a note promising to pay the bearer so much coin on demand. The use of the ambiguous word currency has made people forget this fact. Who shall be authorized to issue such notes, to what extent, and under what conditions, are questions of commercial policy, the answers to which will vary with the circumstances of different countries. But in all countries alike, the right is limited to those who have the coin and are ready on demand to pay it; and this holds good in the case of Governments as well as in that of private corporations. Issuing notes without the means or intention of paying is just as much a fraud when committed by a Government as it would be when committed by a bank. Any political breach of commercial honesty in that direction, or in the direction of inflation, will soon bring its own condemnation in an unmistakable form; American bank bills will be at a premium in Canada.

It may be added, that of all remedies for the commercial distress, the most strangely inappropriate would be what, by a confusion of thought already noted, is called an increase of the currency. It would be like injecting water into a man suffering from dropsy. Throughout the crisis there has been a glut of money. The dearth, both in England and here, has been of investments. Masses of money lay in the London banks at a nominal interest. The main cause of the crisis has been over-production, and excessive increase of the means of production, stimulated by a previous period of rapid development, which was brought suddenly to a close, partly in consequence of a break in railway enterprise. To fancy that any relief can be obtained by furnishing Government with a printing press, and bidding it print off quantities of irredeemable paper, would surely be most absurd.

—Any possible task would be well performed by Sir Alexander Galt. The task of divorcing Canada commercially from

her own hemisphere, and wedding her to the other, is not possible. It is a desperate attempt to make nature bend to the dictates of political prejudice. The political part of Sir Alexander's mission will be jealously watched by those who prize Canadian self-government, and it is satisfactory to see that Mr. Blake is on the alert. Our relations with the Government of the Mother Country are defined by the British North America Act, and, in case of necessity, the Governor-General is the constitutional medium of communication. What then are the matters in which the Canadian Privy Council requires the "support" of the British Cabinet, and finds it necessary to receive that support, not openly, but with cabinet secresy, through a quasi-Minister domiciled in London? They ought to be, at least, intelligibly described.

—Once more, in a very positive form, if not from a very authoritative source, comes the announcement of a projected scheme of Imperial Confederation. It would be like Lord Beaconsfield to float that magnificent speculation before he retired. Let the scheme be considered by all means. That this great country can for ever remain in the present limbo between dependency and nationality, nobody ventures to assert. Everybody—Sir Francis Hincks and Sir Julius Vogel, as well as the rest,—avows or betrays his conviction that we shall some day have to choose between Imperial Confederation, Nationality, and Continental Union: as to Annexation, in the ignominious sense of the term, there will be danger of it only if Canada is brought on her knees by the consequences of reckless expenditure. The most extreme quietist pleads only for an indefinite delay, and for blindness to the future, which would be very well if, in the meantime, no Pacific Railway were being built, and no false direction were being given to our political character and institutions. The policy hitherto pursued has pointed in its whole course towards self-government, of which the consummation is nationality. Yet it is natural

that, as the goal comes in view, there should be a qualm and a desire on the part of some to reverse the process. Imperial Confederation, in a nebulous state, fills many minds; it is well that it should assume a definite form, and be brought at once under practical consideration. Are the people of Canada willing, for the sake of a nominal representation at Westminster, to bear their share of the military taxation of the Empire, and to pay for its repression of Balkan nationalities, for its South African and Afghan wars? Are they ready to resign their freedom of commercial legislation, and their power of regulating their own tariff? These are the first questions to be asked. Until they are both answered in the affirmative, it is idle to go further. When they are, the federationists may proceed to the details of the scheme, in which they are likely to find work enough for their diplomacy, considering the number of the communities, at present self-governed, whose consent is to be obtained. The French and Spanish Colonies are represented in the Parliament of the Mother Country; but they have not, like the great British Colonies, a political life of their own: they are mere dependencies. Algeria is not a growing nation; it is a barrack, a theatre, and a café. The destiny of Canada is being debated by a Council in London—will Canadians be guilty of treason if they debate it here?

—A notable omission in the Governor-General's Speech prepared us for the confession that, with regard to the primary object of all tariffs, the equalization of revenue with expenditure, the success of the New Tariff had been imperfect. Its friends have to fall back upon its secondary advantages as a mode of protecting and fostering native industry. It is not easy to distinguish its beneficial effects in this respect from those of the good harvest; though, if unseasonable weather lasts, that disturbing element in the calculation is too likely to be removed. A hope has been excited by the Boston move-

ment that the third object of the Tariff, the coercion of the United States into a renewal of reciprocity, may be accomplished; but it is not probably that this hope will be fulfilled: the weakness of partial reciprocity has been revealed: the set of American opinion appears to be decidedly against it; and it is unlikely that the greater country, with the tide of prosperity flowing, will allow itself to be coerced by the smaller.

—Before this comes into the hands of our readers a caucus will probably have decided the great question who is to be the leader of the Opposition. But let the caucus decide as it may, if Mr. Blake will only spread his sails, the wind is blowing which will surely waft him to the front. Nobody doubts Mr. Mackenzie's integrity, industry, or value as a departmental minister: but defeat sits upon his helm. It is his misfortune to be the too faithful organ of an influence narrowly personal, which, for the last twenty years, has marred the fortunes of the party. He is compelled to tread with measured steps the narrow path of Grit orthodoxy, while opinion is rolling past him on the open plain: and he is inextricably committed, though more by compliance than conviction, to the railway policy, independence of which is, at this juncture, the most essential qualification for leadership of the Opposition. His recent exhibition of courtly zeal with regard to the address of congratulation was not only an unconscious breach of the delicacy which leaves such matters to the Government, but a revelation of unexpected weakness.

—M. Girouard brings in the Bill to legalize marriage with a wife's sister, called in England the bill for the abolition of aunts. On this well worn theme we will only remark that no time need be wasted over the precepts of the Mosaic law. That law relates to Oriental and primeval marriage, and embodies the primeval idea of immortality, which was not individual life

in another world, but representation by posterity in the tribe. As to the practical question, it cannot be denied that there are arguments on both sides, so far at least as the widower and sister-in-law themselves are concerned; but the interest of the children seems clearly to point to the legalization of the marriage as giving them the best chance of a kind step-mother. In case of doubt liberty ought to prevail.

—There is certainly a growing opinion, on general grounds as well as on that of economy, in favour of abolishing the Lieutenant-Governorships, and setting the Provincial Assemblies to their proper work. That local self-government is an excellent thing everybody knows, but its excellence depends on its being local. Mix up the functions and attributes of a central with those of a local legislature and you produce a hybrid which, like other hybrids, will be unfruitful. A measure regulating the relations of law and equity is clearly work not for a local, but for a central legislature. The subject is one which taxes to the full the powers of the most eminent jurists. In a national assembly such men are found; and the body of the House, if it fairly represents the best intellect of the country, will be an appreciative and critical audience, though it may not be qualified to take part in the work. But in a local assembly this legislation, so important in its consequences to commercial and general life, must be conducted by two or three lawyers, not at the head of the profession, nor likely to be above its interests and prejudices, while a party of worthy farmers attends to make a quorum. Hear the plain-spoken Mr. Rosevear on the present Bill:—

> For my part I don't understand one word about this Bill. I have asked gentlemen of the profession in the House if they understood it, and they said they did not; and I do not know that the Attorney-General does. (Laughter.) I believe the Attorney-General means well enough by the Bill; but he has been led away by some one or other who has been posting him up, and he has got wrong. (Renewed laughter.) I am not going to say one

word about the lawyers on one side of the House or the other; but I have often said that it makes no difference on what side of politics a lawyer is, they will always advocate the same thing, so long as it is in the interests of the lawyers. (Laughter and applause.) I am a politician, and will stick to my party as long as I think they are right; but the lawyers don't do that. They stick to their own party so long as their own interests are not at stake, and when their interests are at stake they leave it. It's my opinion that the laymen might as well go out into the lobby or into the smoking-room while the lawyers are passing this Act. (Applause.)

—Opposition amidst its depression has been filled with ecstacy by the publication of the Lieutenant-Governor's accounts for his trip to Manitoba. A poor Monthly comes in too late for the fun, and can only have a hand in the dull work of pointing the moral. In the name of common sense what can be the use of such Royalty as this? We fully admit the force of sentimental as well as of practical considerations; but what sentiment can be kindled by a delegated Majesty which is compelled to scuffle for its railway fares and its bath-towels, its theatre tickets and its drinks? What good purpose of any kind can be served by bringing down with pop-gun salutes and an escort of six men a figure in an antiquated costume to read a speech not a word of which is its own, one the exact opposite, perhaps, of that which it was made to deliver the session before? Where can be the use of having the Provincial Ministry nominally appointed by a potentate who, if he attempts really to exercise the power, as the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec did the other day, is immediately kicked out as a usurper? The hypocrisies of Constitutional Monarchy on a grand scale may be august; on a small scale they are ridiculous. As a political officer, the Lieutenant-Governor is notoriously nothing, and of nothing nothing comes. Fancy assigns to him and his lady high value as the heads of Provincial society. Fine pictures are drawn of a wealthy and hospitable pair, with the finest manners, making the Government House a social centre, and diffusing happiness and refinement around them. But where are such people to be found? Supposing they were

found, what should induce them to give up their pleasant home and their congenial circle for publicity without power, and parade without distinction? And supposing them to be both forthcoming and willing to take the place, what Prime Minister could afford to pass over the claims of men who had served the party in order to provide an agreeable *salon* for the Province? It is preposterous to expect that these appointments will ever be treated as anything but rewards for steady voting and reimbursements of money expended in elections. Sir John Macdonald is now peering under every bush for the next King of Ontario. Why cannot he take Nature at her word, and relieve us of an office which there is nobody to fill?

But if the Constitutional King is removed, how are the Provincial Ministers to be appointed? That this question should be asked, and asked as if it really admitted of no answer, shows how our minds, once set running in the strangest groove, can be made to take it for the only conceivable course. Why should not the Provincial Assembly appoint its officers as other bodies appoint theirs—by regular election? What real objection is there to this plan? Why should a Provincial Council, any more than a County Council, or a body of stockholders, be required to go through the strange process of telling itself off into factions, with a rope stretched between them, and choosing its executive by "tug of war?" If regular elections were substituted for the faction fight, there would be an end, of course, of a game to which the players have become accustomed. There would be an end of wirepulling, bribery, gerrymandering, and voting black white to keep a particular man or set of men in power. We should have no more compacts with Roman Catholic Archbishops, no more election placards promising a local expenditure of a million if the Minister gains the seat. But the best men in the Province would be eligible to the executive, without reference to their opinions on irrelevant questions; the electoral power, instead of being engrossed by the wirepullers, would be restored to the people; the members of the Assembly would become fair critics, instead

of being blind accomplices, or blind assailants of the Government; and instead of the time being spent in the scuffles and wrangles of mock parties, the business of the Province would be done. It would be done much better, and in half or a quarter of the time. Perhaps, when reduced to its proper proportions, and divested of its frivolities, it might be done by public-spirited men without pay; in which case, not only would money be saved, but the number of temptations to enter the evil trade of politics would be diminished.

Thanks mainly to the husbandry of Sandfield Macdonald, a man who, though his ways were sometimes queer, was loyal at heart to the public service, Ontario still has a surplus. When that has been spent, she will begin to think of economy. About the same time the mind of the Dominion will probably be turned by the stress of circumstances in the same direction, and general simplification of the machinery of Government will become the order of the day. At present, for a population of four millions, we have eight kings, one central and seven provincial, as many Parliaments, and sixty-five Ministers of the Crown; while England is content with a single king, a single Parliament, the members of which are not paid, and a single Cabinet, seldom containing so many members as the Cabinet of Ottawa. We have also judges and chief justices as the stars of heaven in number. It may be doubted whether any country in the world has so much government as that which, of all perhaps, requires the least. The framers of our Constitution acted, and our people to a great extent still act, in a state of elation which prevents the voice of economy from gaining the public ear. We are possessed with the notion of boundless territories, to be filled to-morrow, or next day, with swarming millions, and of unlimited resources, warranting expenditure as unlimited, and making parsimony almost treason to our greatness. An eloquent Governor-General, in quest of popularity, serves out with his champagne indiscriminate flattery of the country, and extravagant predictions of its development, which intoxicate the people because they come from his lips. We

cannot agree with those who make it a point against the Lieut.-Governor of Ontario, that he did not in his trip emulate Lord Dufferin's speeches which, printed in a row, as they now are, form a collection of elegant flummery almost unique in literature, with hardly a syllable of sober truth from the beginning to the end. Politicians of both parties alike share, or affect to share, the illusion. Only in private does prudence venture to whisper that the resources of Canada are really limited, that her wealth must depend on her frugality, and that an unambitious happiness is her lot. Public debt is piled up heedlessly, because a couple of hundred millions can matter nothing to those who are about to enter into a fabulous heritage of opulence and grandeur. We are ready, for a mere freak of ambition, to spend a hundred millions on the incorporation of British Columbia. This will probably be the awakening; and we shall find that we have been forestalling not only the actual future of our country, but a magnificent dream.

—It is satisfactory to see that the Local Ministry of Education has at last mustered courage to deal with the Book Depository. The conclusive reasons for this step were before the Government six years ago, and all the waste of money and the additional accumulation of stock (probably of much the same quality as of old) which have been going on since that time might have been spared. Perhaps this saving may enable the Government to refrain from signing the death warrant of the Toronto School of Art, from which they have announced their intention of withdrawing aid to an extent that would be fatal to its existence. Without these schools, there can be no skill in design; and skill in design is the only passport to industries which enrich as well as refine, and which, if the agricultural importance of these Eastern Provinces should ever fall off, would become still more valuable to our people.

It is satisfactory to see that some members, at least, of the Legislature take an interest in the university question. That

subject is coming again to the front, and it will bring with it some cognate subjects of a kind solid enough to command the attention even of the most agricultural assembly. One of these is Practical Science, for want of which, as we have been told by the highest authority, our youth are missing golden opportunities, and which cannot be given effectively by a starveling appendage to a single college, as the experiment which, embodied in a form of loveliness, confronts Toronto University, seems to have proved. With the present requirements of science the resources of all our colleges clubbed together are barely sufficient to maintain such a department on a proper footing. Meantime, just over the line, there is Cornell University offering instruction in practical science of the best kind, and at the cheapest rate. The arguments in favour of University consolidation have been repeated to satiety. Students cannot be taught without an adequate staff, library, and apparatus; while that other, and perhaps higher, function of a university which consists in the advancement of learning and science, cannot be well discharged without the co-operation and interaction of a number of learned and scientific minds. The present system of isolation is the offspring of accident, for which nobody now living is at all to blame, saving perhaps those who, in face of experience and the general conviction, gave a charter to a seventh university at London. But among other bad consequences, a calamitous divorce is being produced between State endowment and private munificence. Queen's College is being built up by private munificence into a rival to the Provincial University, while Toronto engrosses the State endowment. If the different Colleges could be federated into a Provincial University, private munificence would enrich the several Colleges, as it does at Oxford and Cambridge, while the staff and apparatus of the common University would be appropriately kept up by State aid. All wholesome feeling of attachment to the College would, as in the cases of Oxford and Cambridge, remain entirely unimpaired. Let the Minister of Education reflect that procrastination is not only the thief of time but

of opportunity, and lay hold at once upon a problem which is difficult enough as it is, but which, if the present system of local Colleges once becomes rooted in large endowments, will be hopeless.

The School Book controversy, which has broken out with fresh fury, may find a solution when Consolidation, in any form, gives us a really Provincial University. The old Council of Public Instruction was abolished, under untoward though pressing influences, with a headlong haste which hardly permitted courtesy, much less discrimination. It had very weak points, the worst of which was the difficulty of assembling the country members; but for the selection of school books it was by far the best authority that we have yet had. It was competent; and it was above not only influence but suspicion. A board of School Officials may be competent; it may possibly be above influence; but it will never be above suspicion. The Senate of a Provincial University, or a committee of such a body, would have all the qualifications of the old Council.

Mr. Badgerow is to be commended for taking up University questions, but hardly for proposing to introduce reporters into the Senate. There are already ladders enough for aspiring orators and politicians. Let us have in one or two places a little quiet and practical deliberation.

—The clause in the Taxes Exemption Bill, taxing lawns and gardens at the same rate as ground occupied by houses, will probably act as a prohibition; for few can afford lawns and gardens at such a cost. Those who desire them, as most who rise in the world do, will go out of Toronto; the value of land in the city will at the same time be reduced by the quantity thrown on the market; and thus the financial gain is not likely to be very considerable, while injury will be done, both to the beauty and to the healthiness of the city. If the people really are persuaded that the possession of a lawn or garden is a public wrong, by all means let lawns and

gardens go: anything is better than that the bread of labour should be leavened by a sense of injustice. But if the cry comes only from the Aldermen, we may be permitted to use our privilege of grumbling so far as to lament that the necessity for abolishing the only luxury which is a benefit to the community was not obviated by integrity and frugality in the management of our municipal affairs. At least we may wish success to the Mayor of Toronto in his effort to improve the city government by making it less ephemeral, and at the same time less a prey to the petty influences of the separate wards.

That the Tax Bill is not extended in full force to ecclesiastical possessions is due, no doubt, to the pressure of a powerful Church upon the Government, both from within and from without. This question is the light cloud that flies before a storm. In every nation in Europe, even the most devoutly Roman Catholic, the devouring growth of Church property has at last brought on a crisis: the same thing will in the end take place here, devout Quebec leading the way.

—A new table of precedence has been put forth by the authority of the Governor-General for this aristocratic country. We accept with grateful reverence the revised gospel of our social life. Only in reference to one article will we venture to make a remark, or rather to repeat one made by an authority much higher than ourselves. Mr. Hallam says that the title of Lord Bishop, though the Puritans took exception to it, was not open to objection, being a consequence of the tenure of episcopal estates by barony; but, he adds "this will not cover our modern *colonial* bishops, on some of whom the title has, without any good reason, been conferred." It is curious to see with how much pertinacity, and with what success, the Bishops of the Anglican Church struggle to maintain the title and the social rank of prelates of an Establishment in a country of which perfect religious equality is now the law. They are a good deal more be-lorded here than they are in England. It is true their

Roman Catholic rivals do the same. Will a Bishop of the Episcopal Methodists be entitled to precedence?

—The community has been horror-stricken by a sanguinary case of lynching; for such evidently is the nature of the Lucan tragedy, though there is mingled with it something of the Tipperary feud. "There's Tipperary, bluidy Tipperary!" we remember hearing an Irishman exclaim with gusto, as he caught sight of the well-known hills. After all we are not so very different from that Publican; society, on both sides of the line, being identical in structure, is liable to the same maladies. Lynching is bad and must be rooted out; but it is not necessarily indicative of general lawlessness. It is necessarily indicative only of a weak police, which again may bespeak, and, in the case of the older States of the Union, certainly does bespeak, not general lawlessness, but that general respect for law which, under ordinary circumstances, renders a strong police needless. Life and property can not be more secure than they are as a rule in the rural districts of New York. But not many years ago, a gang of brigands established itself in one of those districts, and harried the country around, till the people, having no legal force to protect them, took the law into their own hands and destroyed the gang. There have been other instances of such irruptions of banditti into neighbourhoods similarly unprotected, followed by equally violent measures of self-redress on the part of the people. The Vigilance Committee of San Francisco was the same thing on a large scale. California had been flooded by a robber horde, which it was impossible to bring to justice, and society could preserve itself only by meeting war with war. Our proper remedy, as we cannot afford always to keep up a costly police, seems to be a small body of central constabulary, always ready to be thrown upon any point where violence has got the upper hand of local authority. With the aid of such a force the outrages of the Donnellys would have been repressed, and the neighbourhood would not have been

goaded to the act of lawless and bloody vengeance which has brought disgrace on Canadian civilization.

—The Toronto Theatre has re-opened well with Shakespeare and Neilson. Ultra-culturists, such as Mr. Matthew Arnold, are never tired of defiling the graves of the Puritans, for having shut up the playhouse. The playhouse which the Puritans shut up was a brothel, as any one may see, if he chooses, after providing himself with proper means of ablution, to look into the plays of the period. The playhouse now, in respectable hands at least, is not a brothel, but a school of pure and generous sentiment as well as a place of liberal amusement, and we may all rejoice to see it well filled. If the Puritan feeling lingers in some minds, it deserves respect; but it has outlived the state of things which made it reasonable, as may be said also of the feeling, similar in its origin, against dancing. On the other hand, the culturists expect too much: actors and actresses are not priests and priestesses: when they have given us an evening's innocent pleasure, and at the same time awakened right sympathies, they have done their part. There is a limit, though some rhapsodists seem not to think so, to the spiritual benefits of seeing Rachel or Sarah Bernhardt.

The influence of the drama proper has been a good deal curtailed on one side by the opera, which in London and Paris draws away by its combination of delights, perhaps also by its sensuousness, those who in former days were the best patrons of the theatre; on the other side by the novel, which, in fact, is to us what the drama was to the generation of Shakespeare. Life is far less dramatic now than it was in the time of the Tudors. Romance, vicissitude, pathos have not departed; the wheel of fortune still turns; diversities of character are perhaps more multiplied than ever; but the interest of action is more diffused, the play of emotion is less upon the surface; costume is dead; and social situations, however thrilling, are seldom picturesque. The narrator who can lift the curtain of

the heart has an immense advantage over the dramatist, who is confined to that which is seen or uttered. We are not likely to have a Globe Theatre again. If Thackeray had lived in the reign of Elizabeth, he would certainly have written plays. If Shakespeare had lived in the reign of Victoria, he would have written novels. As it is, he sometimes goes where the mere actor cannot follow him. All Hamlets are failures, because in that character, thought and feeling preponderate; perhaps also because nobody who had the sensibility to feel the part, would have nerve to act it.

—In watching the eddies of American politics there are two questions which we always ask. Are the people of the United States becoming conscious that faction is their great danger? Are they, or any of them, trying to break its yoke? There is still abundant motive power of reform; there are still ample grounds for hope. As yet despondency and cynicism are alike out of place. He who goes into any one of the better states of the Union, and visits the village and the farm instead of the city and the town will find such store, not only of genuine worth, public and private, but of political intelligence as he will not find in any other country in the world. Slow, too slow, to move, this saving power when it does move often betters the most sanguine expectations. But even this store is not inexhaustible. Maine has shewn that the perpetual faction fight, with the passions which it kindles, with the intrigue, the bribery, the electioneering trickery, the villainy of all kinds, which it sets at work, with the ever-increasing ascendency of scoundrels which is its inevitable accompaniment, must in the end deprave the character even of the best of people. There is no salvation for the Republic, but in escape by some outlet or other from the party system. By what road an escape can be effected, it is not easy to say. Every year these two vast conspiracies strengthen their organization and carry to higher perfection their evil discipline. Every year

the fatal prize for which they contend grows more dazzling, the excitement of the contest deepens, the efforts of the factions grow more desperate and their practices worse. A direct attack upon the system appears almost hopeless. When it was attempted by the convokers of the Cincinnati Convention, intrigue got possession of the Councils of Reform, and a fiasco ensued which left matters worse than ever. Hope, however, dawns in another quarter. It seems as though Bolting and Scratching, though their names are homely, might be destined to open the way, at least, for the redemption of the commonwealth. In the State of New York the other day the Republicans who scratched Mr. Cornell, the Anti-reform Candidate of the Conkling Republican Machine, numbered not less than twenty-five thousand, and they would have beaten the Machine had it not been for a bolt from the other side which, while it counteracted their movement at the polls, testified to the action of the same disintegrating force. Butlerism in Massachusetts and Fusionism in Maine were both of them secessions from the regular parties, and partial victories of local and material interests over the regular issue of the Bloody Shirt. The Cincinnati Convention itself, though it failed, was a considerable fact, and indicated that there was a real force on the side of reform if it could find the right leaders and be directed to the mark. Grant was endorsed the other day as the Republican candidate for the Presidency by the Pennsylvania Convention, under the pressure of the local Machine worked by Don Cameron, the son and heir of that Simon Cameron who was expelled from Lincoln's first War Cabinet for treachery and corruption, of which not even the mortal peril of his country, in her darkest hour, could suspend the reign in his breast; and it is not unlikely that when the National Convention of the party meets in the spring the decision of the local may be confirmed by that of the general Machine. But it is evident that a good many Republicans will be inclined to bolt, either on the anti-dynastic ground, or because they see in Grant and his circle the arch-enemies of Civil Service Reform. What may be called an

Anti-Machine manifesto has already been put forth by a number of independent Republicans in Pennsylvania. These gentlemen say they want honourable contests for the Presidency, and no "cogged dice." When they have got to the root of the matter they will see that what they really want is no contests for a Presidency at all. The institution has turned out wholly different from that which was intended by the framers of the Constitution, who supposed that the President would be elected by the Presidential electors, while they had no conception of organized party. So long as it exists on its present footing there will be cogged dice, Camerons, and all that the manifesto deprecates, let patriotism protest as it may.

That in case of a re-election of Grant there may possibly grow up a national and patriotic opposition to the power of the Presidency itself, would seem to us, as we have said before, a redeeming part of that otherwise sinister event. Some of our American friends, for whose judgment we have great respect, tell us that we were wrong in surmising that Grant once re-elected would be re-elected for life. We reasoned thus:—If Grant is re-elected it will be through a Machine which by that victory will have proved itself stronger than all the elements of opposition, whether Democratic or Independent. Four years more of power and patronage will at once increase the strength of the Machine and bind the machinists more closely than ever to Grant; and this may go on, and is likely to go on, so long as Grant lives. That many loyal Republicans would be very indignant, there can be no doubt; but the question is whether they would be able to give effect to their indignation; and it must be borne in mind that if there is a strong anti-dynastic feeling among good patriots, there is also a good deal of dynastic feeling among the renegade rich. Imperialism in any shape always has attractions for the selfish wealth whose ideal is perfect security for the enjoyment of a trough full of dainties in a gilded sty. Even for better citizens, political repose would have its charms. That it is in Grant's character to be guilty of anything in the way of violent usurpation, we

cannot for a moment believe. Everything in his record, everything in his bearing as the victorious commander of the armies of the Republic, acquits him of such criminal aspirations. Besides he must know very well that the army would not obey him if he ordered it to fire on the Constitution. But he aims at a life-presidency and the men about him aim at it for him; otherwise he and they would not fail to set the mind of the country at rest by a distinct disclaimer. It must be owned, too, that he has shown rather an ominous amount of reticent astuteness in creeping to his mark. He somewhat reminds us of the sinister taciturnity of Monk.

Evidently the Grand Tour had its object. It was intended by Barnum if not by the Elephant as a political advertisement on the most splendid scale. To choose the head of the State by foreign suffrages would be like the Americans, who, though accused of excessive self-esteem, are of all people in the world, the most sensitive to foreign opinion, especially to that of old and aristocratic nations. But in the case of General Grant, America and Europe have been somewhat at cross purposes. America fancied that Europe was paying homage to Grant's greatness; in truth she was only paying a compliment to America, whose idol she took Grant to be. As a statesman Grant does not stand higher in other countries than he does in his own. As a soldier he is acknowledged to have been a potent sledge-hammer of war, to have shown the utmost courage, energy, tenacity, and a resolution approaching to ruthlessness in the use of the vast resources at his command; by those who are more intimately acquainted with his history he is allowed in all combined operations to have displayed a generous and magnanimous loyalty to his colleagues and to the common cause; but with strategic genius he is not credited; in that Sherman is deemed his superior, the highest praise of all being reserved for General Lee. The murderous battles on the Rappahannock were generally condemned by military men in Europe as a terrible waste of life which brought Grant no nearer to Richmond, while without such bloodshed

Lee might have been held at bay and prevented from detaching any corps till the march of Sherman had pierced the Confederacy to the heart. Whether this opinion was right or wrong, it is for soldiers to decide. What is certain is that the European ovation was not a personal tribute to General Grant. Afterwards, when a vague hope dawned that his armed hand might put down democracy, he became an object of personal interest in England, but to the Court party alone.

Of the attempt to supersede election by count in Maine there is an end; having lost, the conspirators will live only in infamy. But has the attention of the people of the United States been turned to a danger of the same kind, at the very heart of the Republic, against which there seems at present to be no safeguard? In England, during the dark days of political corruption, contested election cases were decided by a committee of the whole House; the consequence of which was, that barefaced partizanship put justice out of doors, and a minister finding himself hard pressed, did not blush to pass the word down his ranks that no quarter must be given in elections. The Grenville Act was thought to have wrought a great reform by substituting a select committee for a committee of the whole; but even into select committees partizanship found its way, and the integrity of elections was not secured till the trials were transferred to the judges, whose decisions command universal respect, and whose ermine has contracted no stain. But in the United States the system is still virtually that of England in the Walpolean era. We have ourselves witnessed, in the House of Representatives, the decision of an election case by a partizan majority, manifestly regardless of truth and right. When a faction wants to add to its strength, it calls up a contested election case and seats its own candidate by a strict party vote. Is there any limit to the fabrication of election cases, or the decision of them by the party in power? If not, where is the security for the fair representation of the people? Where is the security against the foulest malpractices on the part of a faction, which feels itself tottering, but has still a

majority in the House? Disastrous experience shows that it is not to be found in the morality of Party.

—It is announced that a female Crœsus, following in the steps of "Baron Albert Grant," has bought of some needy European Government the title of Marchioness. Under the Stuarts the same thing might have been done in England: the price paid for peerages in those days was actually entered in the books of the Exchequer. But in these days the process is more tortuous; instead of paying the money to the Crown, you invest it in land, become a county magnate, get yourself elected to Parliament, vote steadily with the Government, and at last are made a peer. The "marchioness," however, if the report is true, will have done a service in two ways: she will have shown what titles of nobility mean; and she will have shown what are the tendencies of Shoddy. Beyond doubt, there are hundreds of wealthy men and women who would hold up both their hands for a court at Washington. Already they have imitations of the English "Court Journal," which, of course, outshine the original as the gorgeous flunkey outshines his master. The glorious fact is recorded that a New York lady has appeared with $800,000 worth of diamonds on her person; it is a wonder her dresses are not trimmed with bank bills. Kearney is unattractive; but if he and the Marquis of Petroleum fight, civilization, and even conservatism, ought to pray that Kearney may win. The most dangerous class of all is that which, by its vulgar ostentation of wealth, excites among the people at once envy and contempt. There are, in the United States, in larger numbers, as we believe, than in any other country, rich men who keep their hearts above their wealth, who hold it really as a trust, who give their gold lavishly to every good object, and labour, which is more precious than gold, to every social improvement and to every righteous cause. The land is full of the monuments of their beneficence, and the world has no higher examples of the beauty and hap-

piness of a noble life. But it takes all their virtue and all their munificence to counteract the social mischief that shoddy fashion works.

It has been truly said, in connection with the Irish case, that Ireland does not suffer more from absenteeism than the United States. Every pleasure city in Europe now swarms with rich Americans, squandering and demoralizing wherever they go. How many of these tourists are really led to the old world by liberal curiosity or even by the pursuit of healthy pleasure? The expenditure in foreign lands of a vast amount of the fruits of American labour is the least part of the evil. Even the desertion of political and social duty is not the worst. The worst is the effect on political character. Rich Americans are thus taught always to sigh for lands in which wealth can command servility. They become apostates from equality and social justice. They are thenceforth bad citizens of the Republic. In grovelling before European royalty and rank they outdo everything that is most abject in Europe itself. Beneath the sun there was nothing less lovely than the American colony in Paris under the Empire. We remember reading in the French correspondence of an American paper a chuckling announcement that the American ladies in Paris had combined with the Russian ladies to exclude the Englishwomen from society for not dressing with sufficient splendour. Fancy Shoddy cutting Lady Ashburton, Lady Waldegrave, or Lady Theresa Lewis, for not bedizening herself like a kept mistress! A moderate absentee tax, if a way of imposing it could be devised, would be not less salutary than just, and the greatest gainers by it would be those whom it would compel to stay in their homes and attend to the social duties without which there can be no happiness or dignity in life, let Biddy be as mutinous as she will.

—Mr. Parnell has decidedly broken down. The different objects of his complex mission crossed each other; and what-

ever sympathy the Irish might have with the political or agrarian object, he might have known beforehand, if he had been well advised, that the Americans had comparatively little sympathy with the political object, and with the agrarian none. He lost his temper, and though from the decidedly landlordish composition of the Mansion House Committee, and the impossibility of getting anything done or distributed without party bias in Ireland, it is not improbable that his complaints on that subject may be partly warranted, he put them in the wrong form, and went far astray in his genealogical allusions. Fortunately for him he errs in thinking that the most terrific of termagants, Sarah Jennings, has transmitted her temper and nails to any living descendant. His scuffle with the New York *Herald* has given birth to what may be said to be in effect a grand pecuniary demonstration, under the auspices of the *Herald*, in favour of Conservatism and against the Home Rule cause. In spite of his honesty and courage, which nobody doubts, he is one more illustration of the luckless inability of Ireland to produce a leader. The chief result, so far, of his agitation has been an excitement of Unionist feeling in England which brought out a heavy vote at Liverpool. It is not easy to get a Spaniard or an Irishman to take the obvious course; but the obvious course is to act with the Liberals in Parliament at least till they refuse to take part in some reasonable measure of redress. They have just given Ireland religious equality and an extensive change in the land laws. To raise the banner of national insurrection, which is what Mr. Parnell's language suggests, would be mere madness; if for no other reason, for this, that the people are without leaders from the class above them, that class, since the Liberal system of conciliation has prevailed, having become almost entirely Unionist; and without leaders from the class above them, the people never win.

—An opening of Parliament by the Sovereign in person is about the best lesson in the refinements of the British Constitution. Yonder lady who, amidst the salvos of the cannon, rides to Westminster in the Coach of State, with her lords and ladies in waiting, and her glittering guard of cuirassiers, through a vast crowd all uncovered and huzzaing, is legally the mistress of the Empire, appoints all the ministers, all the bishops, all the judges, all the officers of the army and navy, makes war and peace, has an absolute veto on all legislation. Practically, it has been settled, that she cannot even appoint her own bedchamber women, while her veto belongs to the mythical past. The powers legally hers are all really exercised by a man in the crowd of members of Parliament, whom no insignia distinguish, whose position as head of the Cabinet is not even known to the law, but who is the leader of the dominant party. He wrote the speech which Her Majesty, enthroned on high, reads or directs the Chancellor to read as her own to the assembled Peers. They told George II. that a vagabond had counterfeited the king's speech, but that he should speedily be brought to justice. "Pray," said the king, "leave the poor fellow alone; I have read both speeches and I like the counterfeit the best." A curious piece of constitutional machinery, this, and one not very likely to suit inexperienced nations!

Knowing that Royalty had no real power, English ministers heretofore have taken care to avoid involving it in responsibility, and to keep its dignity clear of party. Lord Melbourne was the young Queen's political tutor; it is well known that she regarded him almost as a father, and that it would have been easy for him, if he had chosen, to let the nation see that her heart was on his side. But Lord Melbourne, though lax in some things, knew the limits of an honourable ambition. Never did he misuse the Queen's name, whatever irresponsible partizans may have done. Sir Robert Peel was equally scrupulous. When he moved the repeal of the Corn Laws, the Prince Consort came down to hear the debate; Lord George Bentinck and Mr. Disraeli, who were then conspiring against

Peel, pretended to believe that he had used Royalty to countenance his policy, and reviled him accordingly; though we have now positive proof that the Prince Consort came down of his own accord, led only by his interest in the subject. But under the present premiership, there has been a signal change. Lord Beaconsfield never loses an opportunity of identifying himself with the Sovereign, and the Sovereign with himself. He seldom makes a defence of his own acts without introducing the Queen's name, and suggesting that his opponents are her enemies. He let the Crown put forth what can only be called a pamphlet in support of his Anti-Russian policy, under the guise of a volume of the "Life of the Prince Consort." And now the Queen is drawn from her seclusion to deliver for him a speech, which is not so much a programme for the session as a special glorification of those acts of the Government in Afghanistan and South Africa which are most vehemently condemned by half the nation. Under this sinister inspiration, the Court is beginning to manifest a temper ominously like that of the Stuarts, which breaks out in demonstrations of marked sympathy with Bonapartism and contemptuous hatred of the French Republic. The fruits of this will appear in the reign. President Grevy, one of the shrewdest of European statesmen, when asked what he thought of Lord Beaconsfield's policy, replied "he has played tricks with constitutional monarchy from which it will never recover." Little cares Lord Beaconsfield, provided the game lasts his time.

—A report went forth that the Premier's stroke of policy, on the question of the suffrage, was about to be repeated on the land question, and that he would take the wind out of the sails of the Liberals by proposing the abolition of primogeniture and entail. The authors of the report forgot that the Tory party was induced to concur in the extension of the suffrage to the populace of the cities, as a last desperate move, for the very purpose of saving the privileges of which the most essential

are primogeniture and entail. It was a drastic medicine and one which may yet prove fatal; but it was not a suicide, as the dose now supposed to be meditated would be. In the middle ages, the English aristocracy was an aristocracy of local judicature and military command: it is now an aristocracy of territorial wealth, without which the mere titles would soon be in the gutter; and the estates are held together, in the great families, by the law of primogeniture and the custom of entail. The law leads and consecrates the custom, though it takes effect itself only in the rare case of intestacy. On the marriage of the eldest son, and as the condition of providing his allowance, the family estate is resettled in trustees, on the principle of primogeniture; and this goes on from generation to generation. There are those who think that if entails were done away with, land, instead of being divided among more owners, would be concentrated in still fewer hands, because the only obstacle to its sale being removed, it would be bought up in great tracts by the colossal millionaires, of whom there are many in England, and with whom territorial aggrandizement and the political influence attached to it are always favourite aims. We happen to know that experienced land agents in England are not of that opinion. But, be this as it may, the permanent retention of estates by particular families would certainly receive a fatal blow: in a large percentage of cases wealth, idleness, and social temptation, acting upon the characters of the young nobility, would be sure to produce effects which would bring many a Stowe and Clumber to the hammer. With primogeniture and entail aristocracy stands or falls. Knowing this right well, the aristocratic government is preparing to conjure the gathering storm by a concession in the shape of a measure giving somewhat larger powers of leasing and improvement to holders of settled estates. The device will not succeed. In this, as in many other instances, that which political agitation might never have accomplished has been brought about by economical causes. By the immensely increased importation of food from abroad, English land has been so much reduced in

value that it is no longer capable, as a commodity, of bearing the burdens and the restrictions of the old feudal system. A good deal of it is already sunk under mortgages, jointures, and rent charges in favour of younger children, laid on it when its value was far higher. Some, even of the landed aristocracy, finding themselves commercially pressed to death between the depreciation and the settlements, are beginning to take part in what they would once have deemed the most revolutionary of all movements. Tenants at will, the delight of the aristocratic landowner, are no longer to be had: there is not a single bid for farms for which there used to be a score; long leases will be demanded by farmers as the only chance of making a profit, and granted by landlords as the only chance of getting any rent: and upon the substitution of long leases for tenantcy at will, the vassalage of the farmer, both social and political, and the landlord's sovereignty will come to an end Ireland, with her Tenant Right, has led the way in this change, as it will probably prove that she has done in the case of Church Disestablishment. Cromwell used to say of her that she was like a blank paper, on which you might try innovations, which in England rooted prejudice would not let you try. He acted on that principle in the case of law reform.

—With the land system is closely bound up that country life of the English squirearchy which to foreigners and colonists seems a social paradise. But a great breach has already been made by non-residence. Formerly the English nobleman or country gentleman lived in his mansion all the year round—unless he had to attend Parliament—entertained his country neighbours, went every day among his farmers and peasantry, fulfilled in some measure, if he was good, the ideal of Sir Roger De Coverley, or Mr. Allworthy; and, if he was bad, was still the great man of the parish. But now, railways, combined with the growing appetite for pleasure, have made the squires restless like the rest; such as can afford it, whether members of

Parliament or not, spend the season in London, and often a great part of the rest of the year at fashionable watering places, in their yachts, or in the pleasure cities of the continent. My Lord, instead of gathering his country neighbours round his board, brings down a party from London for a *battue*. In some districts there can hardly be said to be a resident gentry. The servants are migratory like their masters, and rarely will you find one of the households of the olden time. The truth is, that however charming may be a country seat, country life is dull. For the men, the chief attractions are shooting and foxhunting, and these are now doomed. The holder of a lease, who has laid out capital on his farm, will not allow his crops to be devoured by game, or foxhunters to break his fences and ride over his crops. We recollect a sportsman, who, having grown old, being paralysed on one side, and living in a great house alone, found his only amusement in preserving rabbits, which eat up no small portion of the produce of his estate. He used to go out shooting them in a cart, seated on a music-stool, to enable him to turn his paralysed side. Other solaces for a vacant mind must now be found.

The life of an English lady in a country house is pure and healthy, contrasting favourably with Saratoga; especially if she is good to the poor. The squire is sometimes active in county business, and in the administration of rural justice—extremely rural justice in the case of poachers. But as a rule his existence is a proof that, if labour was a curse in the beginning, to be without it is a curse now. The lilies of the field which neither toil nor spin are beautiful; but the lilies of society which neither toil nor spin are commonly as unlovely as they are useless. Look in upon the squire when a long frost prevents his hunting, or when he is too old to get into his saddle, and see how much bliss he enjoys or diffuses round him. The best and happiest of the race are those who have not been born to the estate, but have come into it after having formed their characters and habits in active life. These men often improve and civilize; but the

ordinary squire walks in the ways of his fathers, agricultural as well as political, and having generally clean forgotten the very little which he learned at college, he has not much civilization to impart. The parson does more in that way than the squire, and it is often urged as a reason against Disestablishment that it would deprive the parish of its only resident gentleman; a singular ground, it must be owned, for maintaining a spiritual institution. As to the religion of the people, it is kept up mainly by a very mean-looking Methodist chapel, under the ban of the squierarchy and the hierarchy alike. But the squire and his family are the Corinthian capital of the column. The shaft is the "Lincolnshire farmer" of Tennyson. The base is Hodge, with three dollars a week to keep himself, his wife, and six children, a hovel for his abode, and the workhouse for the home of his old age. Every phase of humanity, as it passes away, calls for the tribute of a sigh; but if the place of the squierarchy should be taken by an independent yeomanry, combining, with industrial worth, any tolerable measure of education, Canadian experience proves that the change will not be much for the worse.

Another political consequence will almost certainly follow, if the land question becomes practical. The thread of connection between the Whig aristocracy and the Liberals, already frail and dwindling, will be severed. It is a mere historical accident. The Whigs represent the grantees of the monastery lands, who were bound by that pledge to Protestantism and its political alliances. Even the possession of the lands themselves was not perfectly safe before the deposition of James II. To this influence was added the jealousy felt by an aristocracy of such Court favourites as Strafford and Laud. After the Revolution, the Whig families engrossed the government under the name of the Hanoverian dynasty, which they had set upon the throne. George III., by the help of Pitt, shook off the yoke and for a while revived personal government. The Whigs were then driven back on the people, and almost on the Revolution. As leaders of the people, they rode back into

power on the wings of the Reform movement which commenced after the downfall of Napoleon, and carried the Reform Bill of 1832, with the line of Liberal measures which the Bill brought in its train. Then they began to remember that they were a land-owning aristocracy, and to obey the natural bias of their order. The secession of the late Lord Derby and Sir James Graham from the Liberal to the Conservative side was the first of a series which receives additions on one plea or another at every political crisis, and which is morally certain to be continued in the future. In fact, at the last general election, almost the entire Whig section deserted Mr. Gladstone, and the *Edinburgh Review* let fall the mask and avowed its hatred of Liberalism without disguise. A few great families, notably those of Russell and Cavendish, are so bound by tradition and connection that change for them is hardly possible: they enjoy, as their heritage, the leadership of the Party; and probably in their inner councils they justify to themselves their position, on the ground that it enables them to control Radicalism, and that it is safer for the aristocracy, when the democratic axe is gleaming, to have two necks than one. But the alliance between Whigs and Liberals is utterly hollow; and the progress of the land question can hardly fail to bring it to an end.

On the other hand, the same question will probably loosen the bonds between the Tory land-owners and their confederates in the towns. The townspeople have no affection either for the land laws or for the game laws; they would like to have a better chance of buying land, to the possession of which everybody in England attaches a fantastic importance, partly on social grounds. It would also suit their interests much better to have a prosperous yeomanry dealing with the tradesmen in the next town, than great proprietors who are not regularly resident, and buy most things in London. Thus we may possibly see a considerable alteration of the party lines, as well as an appearance of Liberalism as an aspirant to power under its own colours and with leaders of its own.

—Our surmise that Parliament would not at once be dissolved was correct. What the issue of the struggle when it comes will be, nobody, we repeat, who understands the balance of parties, and has watched the veering gales of English opinion, would venture at present to predict. At Liverpool, the Liberals have run their heads against a stone wall: it was impossible that they should carry that old Tory and pro-slavery constituency; but, as they reduced the Conservative majority by a thousand, the result was not a death knell to their hopes. Even Southwark is not decisive: the Liberals there were demoralized by a split, which, of course, would be accompanied by a quarrel, and what is more to the purpose, the metropolis, though traditionally Liberal, in a certain sense, is the very heart of Jingoism, to which the lower populace of the towns and the tavern-keepers, as one man, adhere. On the whole, the result of the bye elections during the last two years has been rather adverse to the Government. At the last election, some thirty borough seats passed by small majorities from the Liberals to the Tories: a slight turn of the tide would transfer them back again, and their recovery, making a difference of sixty on a division, would be almost enough to decide the battle. Any one of a dozen events, foreign and domestic, political and commercial, may turn the wavering scale. That the Tories have not hitherto felt sure of victory is certain; if they had, they would have gone to the country and got another seven years' lease of power. Again and again they have been evidently on the brink of a dissolution; but each time they have been warned by the election agents, of whom they have a first-rate staff, that the omens were adverse, and they have recoiled.

—To what a point English hatred of Russia has been inflamed the rejection by the Common Council of London of a vote of congratulation to the Czar, nearly connected as he is with the Queen, on his escape and that of his family from a fiendish attempt at assassination, shows. Sympathy with Nihilism and

Dynamite is sympathy with devils. The really patriotic and reforming party in Russia has no fellowship with the criminal madness of Bakunin's murderous sect. The emancipator of the serfs, though in the evening of his days he has fallen into a state of pitiable weakness, will ever deserve gratitude as the author of the greatest, the most difficult, and the most perilous reform of this generation, and one which was the indispensable condition of any progress in political liberty. This desperate feud will be a costly heritage to the next generation of Englishmen, unless they can persuade Fortune to guarantee them against all enemies but one. It has already committed England to the passionate pursuit of an object which is at once remote and chimerical (for no nation ever yet succeeded in permanently defeating the destiny of another), at the expense, as the next European crisis will show, of her practical influence over questions at her own door. In some men the feeling amounts to monomania. The Tories are circulating the Jingo speeches of Mr. Cowen, a Radical of the Roebuck type, as the utterances of a Daniel Come to Judgment. Mr. Cowen's motive for joining the Tories, he pretends, is a burning devotion to the cause of oppressed Poland. We remember a rising in Poland; but we do not remember any outburst of Tory sympathy: Toryism in those days was hand in glove with the Czar as the head of European reaction. But Mr. Cowen's logic is queer. Because a century ago, Poland was partitioned by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, he now joins Prussia and Austria in preventing, at the instance of British Toryism, the liberation of the Balkan communities, which had nothing to do with the crime. Such reasoning is, if possible, still stranger in its extension to the case of the Afghans and the Zulus. But if these transcendental Polophilists would only read a little history, they would, perhaps, reconsider their determination to keep the gates of justice shut against mankind, till the special wrongs of Poland have been redressed. Poland, at the time of the partition, was not a free nation, 'true to its own independence, nor were its spoilers uninvited or without excuse. It was a scandalous and pestilent relic of all that was worst in feudal barbarism; an

aristocracy as corrupt as it was anarchic, and as venal as it was corrupt, trampling on a people of wretched and degraded serfs. It invited foreign intrusion by hawking about among foreigners its elective crown. By persecuting dissenters from Roman Catholicism, it half justified Catharine in intervening on behalf of the persecuted. No community, if community it could be styled, ever more manifestly brought doom on its own head. Not that this justified the partition; or exempted the spoiler from the curse which waits on rapine. Poland is the Ireland of Russia, and like Ireland, an unhappy legacy bequeathed to the statesmanship of the present day by the iniquity of the past.

—In the Queen's speech the real objects of the Zulu and Afghan wars are frankly avowed. As to the first, the Queen is made to say that she "is determined to make the frontiers of her Indian empire strong;" in other words, that a quarrel was fastened on Shere Ali as a pretext for seizing on a scientific frontier. As to the second, she is made to say that "her possessions in that part of the world have been relieved from a danger which seriously impeded their advancement and consolidation," which is a virtual avowal that the Zulu territory was wanted to round off the projected African Empire. If a desire to increase your own strength, and to "advance your own possessions" is a sufficient warrant for rapine, there is an end of human rights. That such doctrine should be proclaimed from the Throne of moral and religious England is surely a serious warning against the tendencies of conquest. Upon such proceedings the speech solemnly invokes the blessing of Almighty God. Suppose, after all, there should be a God—how will it fare with filibusterism then? The real reason for pitching on Afghans and Zulus as victims of spoliation is that they are weak; the pretended reason is that they are barbarians. The answer to the pretended reason is in the first place that morality is the essence of civilization, and that

the man, calling himself civilized, who tramples it under foot is of all barbarians the worst; in the second place, that the difference in culture between the Jingo and the Afghan is not greater than between highly-educated members of any community and those who have not enjoyed the same advantages; in the third place, that you cannot do an act of wrong without depraving your own nature, and that it is in this way that retribution comes, and is now coming on the wrong-doer.

—Lord Derby, with his Lancashire influence, joins the Liberals amidst a storm of abuse from the ranks which he leaves, the *Times* now thoroughly Tory and Ministerialist, leading the hiss. It is alleged that the policy against which he is turning is his own. It is and it is not. He is a cold-blooded statesman and seceded not on the ground of morality or generosity, but of prudence: the massacres of Bulgarians and Cretans, the iniquities of Turkish rule, the cry of young nationalities struggling for freedom never touched his heart so long as he thought the course of the Government safe. But when he found himself being drawn into schemes for seizing Syria, or assuming the Protectorate of Asiatic Turkey, his discretion took alarm at once on his own account and on that of the country. He is a typical aristocrat and plutocrat, who thoroughly understands the real interests of his order, and knows that violent and demagogic courses, whether at home or abroad, must lead ultimately to revolution. He will carry with him in the coming contest a good many minds like his own. It is difficult to see how, if he thinks that the Jingo policy is bringing the country into mortal peril, he can do otherwise than oppose it, in common with others who think the same. A public man who wields great influence could hardly stand neutral in a struggle by which the fate of England may be determined. Lord Derby has not assailed his late colleagues, while one of them has called him Titus Oates, and Jingoism has emptied upon him

all the slop-pails of its wrath. Lord Beaconsfield dealt him the most malignant blow of all by inducing his brother, Colonel Stanley, to whom he was known to be greatly attached, to pass a tacit censure on his withdrawal by replacing him in the Cabinet. The Jingoes delighted to repeat that the Queen, in admitting Colonel Stanley to his office, said to him: "The honour of your family will, at all events, be safe in your hands." Any one but a scion of privilege would have shrunk from stepping into place over the honour of a brother.

—From Europe we have still the same news; general disquietude, and rumours of conspiracies between this or the other pair or trio of great powers against the rest. It is supposed that the decision of questions of peace and war has been transferred by political progress from the dark councils of kings to the open parliaments of nations; but there is still wide scope for personal influence, even in nations under Parliamentary government; and the history of the Crimean war shows how an intriguing minister may draw a nation to the brink and thrust it in. We cannot tell what is going on in the Cabinets of Berlin, Vienna, or even in that of London, much less in that of St. Petersburg. The statements cabled, though they look authoritative, are guesses; very improbable guesses if they point to an immediate war between Russia and Germany, though it cannot be said, in face of the growing entanglement of affairs in Central Asia, that there is no danger of a war between Russia and England. Enormous as the armaments are they are still being increased, while Socialism, Communism, Nihilism, and political dangers of all kinds, increase in proportion. In fifteen years the total debts of the European States have mounted from £2,626,000,000 to £4,324,000,000 sterling, and still there is no end. Now and then there come even from the Bismarcks expressions of alarm and faint whisperings of mutual disarmament. But these are at once followed by another increase "as a security for peace." Nor are the

waste of money, the loss of labour, and the perpetual danger all: to these must be added the demoralization of myriads of young men by garrison life and the consequences of their vicious habits to the national character and the public health. On this continent, nature has given us an exemption from war and from the military system, now that slavery, which was itself an intruder, has found its grave; surely there could be no greater blessing; yet, there are those among us who apparently wish to reject it, and do their best to inoculate us with the military spirit, that they may entangle us in European quarrels. Among other things they have made us set up a Military College on a costly scale, which will soon be sending out twenty-five officers a year; and next they will want an army for these officers to command. If garrison life is to be re-introduced here, either in this way or by the renewal of military occupation, our social reformers will find more work on their hands. Of that, British legislation for garrison towns is the revolting and conclusive proof.

In France, moderate Republicanism seems still in the ascendant. The general amnesty for Communists has been rejected, happily for the Republican cause, which some of those men would certainly have compromised in the eyes of the people, who, if not alarmed and repelled by Red violence, are evidently disposed to support the Republic. A combination of Moderates, from different sections, has been formed in the Senate round Dufaure. In the Chamber, where it ought to be, this combination would be a tempering element: in the Senate it is not unlikely to be the beginning of another collision between the Houses, such as brought the Republic to death's door in May, 1877. Another illustration of the effect of the Bi-cameral system is being afforded in Italy, where the two Chambers having fallen foul of each other about the Grist Tax, Parliament is to be dissolved; and, if the Government, which has now a majority in the lower House, wins, the Senate is to be coerced by a swamping creation of Senators. An institution which seems devised for the purpose of throwing

the State into periodical convulsions will, surely before long, be submitted to the investigation of common sense, aided now by a tolerably sad experience.

—One interesting result of the break-up of the Ottoman Empire seems likely to be the restoration of Palestine to the Jews. The restoration of Palestine to the Jews it will be, rather than the restoration of the Jews to Palestine; for few of the race are likely to desert the stock exchanges for the Courts of Sion. Students of Prophecy will hail its fulfilment; general sentiment will be gratified by the tribute to a nation which, in its better day, did great things for religion, and through religion for civilization. Perhaps some of the more stubborn Jews will be drawn off from western communities and leave the remainder more capable of assimilation. At all events the situation will be defined, and the anti-Jewish movements, such as that in Roumania, and that which has now assumed strange and startling proportions in Germany, will be seen as what they really are, not religious persecutions, but struggles of race.

The Jews are not a Church, but a tribe. Their God is a tribal God; he is the God of Israel, not of other nations. Out of his worship, which was higher and more moral than that of the gods of other tribes, was developed a universal religion, a religion of humanity, which proclaimed that the same God had made all men of one blood. But this religion the Jews rejected and persecuted. In so doing they made a fatal mistake, and they have suffered for their mistake like other races. A tribe they remain, with a tribal feeling, and a tribal idea of their moral duties towards other nations. They keep themselves a separate people by a tribal rite in contrast to the Christian rite of baptism which is moral and universal. They are all citizens, more of Jewry than of the land which is the place of their sojourn. The strict among them refuse, in the spirit of tribal exclusiveness, intermarriage with the people among whom they dwell. The Christian faith being universal, all Christians wish

to impart it; the Jew keeps his religion to himself, deeming it the heritage of his tribe; he no more thinks of imparting it than a Brahmin of imparting his caste. Those who refuse to mingle with humanity must take the consequences of their refusal. They cannot expect to enjoy at once the pride of exclusiveness, and the sympathies of brotherhood.

The dispersion of the Jews, and their peculiar commercial habits, are not phenomena so absolutely unique as is commonly supposed. We have something like them in the cases of the Armenians, of the Lombards and the Cahorsins, in the Middle Ages, and in that of the modern Greek before the restoration of Greece. But the Jew is the chief of those who, instead of tilling a land of their own, have spread themselves abroad to appropriate by usury and other commercial arts the fruits of the toil of others. For this purpose they have thrust themselves into all communities, and probably their presence has been everywhere an evil except in countries, such as Poland and Turkey, where the military spirit of the natives despised trade. Their wandering, and the commercial habits connected with it, commenced before the destruction of their city. In the Middle Ages they were the instruments and partners of royal extortion, and the cruel maltreatment which they often received was caused less by hatred of their misbelief than of their rapacity. When the risings took place, the rioters made not so much for the synogogues, as for the places where the Jews kept their bonds. The expulsion of them from England by Edward I, although its harshness is now justly condemned, was no doubt a measure of immense relief to the people. The best authorities assure us that the Roumanian farmers are principally moved, not by fanaticism, but by despair at finding their homesteads passing into the hands of a pitiless band of alien usurers; while, curiously enough, Lord Salisbury, who lectures the Roumanian on intolerance, himself excludes Jews on the religious ground from the House of Lords. We all know now that taking the current rate of interest for money is no more wrong than taking the current rate of rent for a house, or the current price for goods;

but there is still such a thing as the usury which gets a simple-minded peasant into its snares and eats up the people as it were bread. It is difficult to tell why a nation should allow itself to be disinherited in this way any more than by an armed invader. The idea that such practices have ever been necessary or useful to commerce is wholly baseless. Florence, Hamburg, Antwerp, London, were built up by the honest labour, and the thrift of Italians, Germans, Flemings, and Englishmen, not by Jewish usury or stock-jobbing, which has never added a grain to the wealth of any country in the world. The Jewish character is not European, but Oriental, and it has undergone for eighteen centuries a training which could not fail to sharpen the wits and enfeeble the moral sense. In politics and in the press it shows, like every other character, the effects of its training, whether it is subtly serving the policy of despots, or, with equal plasticity, bidding for the leadership of revolutions. This is no reason for treating Jews with the slightest harshness; but it is a reason for viewing their progress with anxiety. Germans, on religious questions, are tolerant and something more; but when they find themselves in danger of being turned by the patient craft of the Oriental into hewers of wood and drawers of water for a race that refuses to toil or spin, they can hardly be accused of very shameful bigotry in struggling to keep their fatherland for themselves. They will, no doubt, gladly concur in giving the Jew a land of his own. Had he never become a wanderer and an extortioner, but lived honestly by the sweat of his brow, like the rest of mankind, it would have been far better for himself and for western civilization, while many a dark page would have been torn from the book of history. This may be admitted without the slightest misgiving as to the wisdom and righteousness of the Liberal policy, which, by extending to the Jew, wherever he lives, the full privileges of a citizen, has given him a fair chance of becoming a citizen indeed, as in time he no doubt will.

—Metternich speaks from the grave; but it is little that the renowned shade has to say, for nothing is so dead as the diplomacy of the past. It is unlucky for him that Napoleon, for whose knowledge of man he avows his high respect, speaks from the grave at the same time. "M. de Metternich approaches to being a statesman—he lies very well." This a little spoils the Prince's flourishes about high principles of statesmanship and a society of nations based upon Christianity. In a characteristic passage Metternich describes history as made up of two factors, political events and cabinet secrets. Of the really great elements of history, the moral and intellectual forces which move the world, he had no conception, and the French Revolution seemed to him nothing but a revolt got up by the Jacobins. The consequence was that "the deluge" came not "after" him, but upon him; and he lived to see the wreck of his Holy Alliance and other conservative arrangements floating about like haycocks on its waters.

—A vigorous debate continues on the question Whether, if Religion falls, Morality can stand. The negative was not maintained by the writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* "On the Prospect of a Moral Interregnum," whose paper has supplied a text or rather, perhaps, a cockshy, for the discussion, on this side of the water. What that writer said was that, in the past, religion, though not mythology, had formed the support of morality; that the moral systems of the world so far had always assumed a religious form; and that the ages of religious unbelief had been ages of moral disintegration. This is an historical proposition which no one has yet attempted to confute. If it is true, there is reasonable cause for apprehension that the present break-up of religious belief may be followed by a corresponding disturbance in the moral sphere, at least so far as mankind in general is concerned; and the writer in the *Atlantic* pointed to symptoms of a relaxation of principle which seemed to show that something of the kind was at hand. He is not alone in his view. Some of the strongest of the European Agnostics,

M. Taine for example, "Cassandra" Greg, and the writers in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, are evidently alarmed by the near approach of the crisis which their own philosophy has helped to bring on; and some of them, as we said before, are disposed to make compacts with the Clergy for the purpose of keeping up a salutary superstition among the people and averting danger from opulent and cultivated society. Wisdom and honesty alike condemn such a policy. There is but one hope for perplexed humanity—to push earnestly and fearlessly forward to the truth which, if there is a Power that speaks to us in the higher part of our nature, we shall not fail at last to find.

That without religion the fabric of society will hold together, and that a morality of a certain kind will be sustained by those daily relations of men which are necessary to their subsistence, is proved by the very instances cited from history of the passage of humanity through periods of scepticism; nevertheless, it would be unpleasant to think that we were again approaching a condition like that of Greece at the end of the Peloponnesian war, or that of Italy in the age of Machiavelli. Agnostics point to China, which seems likely to be again exalted to the dignity of a social Utopia enjoyed by it in the days of Voltaire. In China, we no doubt have an example of a community existing on a vast scale, not perhaps absolutely without a religion, but with a religion almost reduced to a political superstition, of which the Emperor is the chief and fathers of families are subordinate gods. But China is proverbially unprogressive: it is a land of stagnation, and now, if we may trust recent observers, a land of decay; while the moral habits of the people and the fiendish cruelties of their penal code are, to say the least, grounds for serious misgiving as to their state of civilization. Let us see a community absolutely devoid of belief, or lingering shadow of a belief, in a Power which upholds righteousness, in the divine authority of conscience, in recompense or retribution of any kind after death, in any consummation of the collective effort of humanity other than a physical catastrophe, yet in its moral

character high, aspiring and progressive: all misgiving will then be at an end. But the question is not settled by the continuance of highly-educated and exceptionally well-disposed men in the path in which they have hitherto walked notwithstanding their rejection of religion. We cannot be sure even that their minds are cleared of the lingering influence of Christianity; while it is certain that, as members of society, they are still supported by Christian influences on all sides.

Mr. Herbert Spencer himself speaks of the inauguration of that which he deems the right and final system of ethics as an event of the future, apparently of a distant future; and he betrays a significant fear of the premature demolition of religious systems, the close connection of which with the popular morality he, at all events, plainly enough discerns. In the same way an Agnostic antagonist of Mr. Malloch in the *Fortnightly Review* undertakes to comfort us with the assurance that "after some tacking" morality will again start forward on the right course. This period of "tacking," and the indefinite interval contemplated by Mr. Spencer, will, for the mass of mankind, be a time of danger. Mischief is not to be looked for from the philosophers and philanthropists; but supposing there should be a great war of classes—a war between those who have not and those who have, those who have not being convinced that unless they can get enjoyment here and now they will never get it at all—would Mr. Spencer's mechanical theory of social development and decay, in which we, for our part, must confess we can see nothing but a vast pseudo-physical nomenclature, control the passions of such a conflict? Not that this is the motive for religious inquiry. The motive for religious inquiry is the hope of gaining that knowledge of the Estate of Man, of the Power in whose hands we are, and of the will and character of that Power, without which other knowledge is of little worth. If Physical Science comes out of her laboratory or her dissecting-room, and forbids us to think of anything that does not fall within her cognizance, we must tell her that before we can obey her injunction, she will have to remake the highest of mammals and unmake Man.

THE BYSTANDER.

APRIL, 1880.

SIR LEONARD TILLEY'S financial statement has been received both in Parliament and by the Press with a volley of rhetorical projectiles which lay ready stored in the arsenal of the Opposition: the fire has been returned with spirit by the Ministerialists; and in the fury of the fray, it is scarcely possible to make out the real opinion of the speakers and writers on either side about the facts, though their feelings towards the persons cannot be mistaken. "When," says the organ of a Senator of the Dominion, "he requested the late Finance Minister to write a novel, Sir Charles Tupper was good enough to supply in his own person a remarkable character for the proposed work. An accurate description of the Doctor would insure the rapid sale of the book. Critics, unacquainted with the career of Sir Charles, might object that the union of his qualities in one character made too great a demand on the credulity of the readers of fiction. Others might say that the human face (*sic*) was maligned by depicting such a person. They would assert that in no civilized country could morality be so low as to permit the continuance in public life of a man guilty in such a transaction as that of the Springhill coal mine." In the name of common sense, what reader would pay any attention to the financial statements and reasonings of writers who approach the subject in such a temper as this?

—The New Tariff was to do three things for us. It was to bring the revenue to a level with the expenditure; to foster native industry by incidental protection; and to coërce the people of the United States into the renewal of Reciprocity. The third object, though not entirely consistent with the second, was distinctly proclaimed by the provision that if the Americans would reduce their duties on our goods, our new rate of duties on their goods should be again reduced in proportion.

That the first object will be attained has certainly not yet been established. There is a deficit of two millions for the past year. For the current year the Finance Minister admits that there will be a deficit of half a million, while his adversaries declare that there will be one of four times, or even eight times, that amount. The estimates on both sides are evidently conjectures, coloured by the emotions of the calculators. That of the Finance Minister has the advantage of being made under the guarantee of responsibility. But even if we accept his view, the prospect is none of the brightest. A deficit remains; while the limit of raising revenue by Customs has apparently been reached. If the duties were further increased there would almost certainly be a decrease of receipts: that well has been pumped dry; and if we persist in our present course of expenditure we must come to direct taxation.

How far the second object has been accomplished we must yet wait awhile to see. The industries which the tariff is supposed to foster have shared the general return of prosperity produced by the good harvest and the revival of the lumber trade; two causes not only independent of the tariff, but operating rather in despite of it, since the farmer and lumberman must have suffered directly by the rise in the price of the commodities which they consume, whatever indirect advantage they may be destined to reap hereafter from the growing number of their customers and the general increase of purchasing power. The sugar refineries are unquestionably gaining largely by the new system; and as that industry is in few hands, it may, without imputing anything wrong to anybody, be said to

furnish a warning against certain dangers incident to tariff legislation in a small country. To manufactures in general a fillip has no doubt been given, not only by the promise of protection, but by the general feeling of hopefulness and enterprise which the change of government diffused. Whether it will be more than a fillip, whether the revival is fresh life or brandy, time alone can show: alike premature at present are the pæans of the Ministerialists and the jeremiads of the Opposition. The sun so far has shone on the new fiscal system: if the next harvest is not good—and the prospect at this moment is but doubtful—we shall see how the system looks when it is under a cloud.

The third object, according to all appearances, will not be compassed, at least in the form which the framers of the tariff have in view, even by the hydraulic pressure of a retaliatory tax on lobster cans. Mr. Wharton Barker, the representative of a great Industrial League in the United States, has published a letter on the commercial relations of the two countries, which he infelicitously addresses to Mr. Brown, but which there can be little doubt reflects the mind of his countrymen. A Reciprocity Treaty, he tells us, we cannot have, because it would be precarious and might be overturned at any moment, like the last, with all the industries built upon it; because it would not get rid of the Customs line; and because it would turn the flank of the American tariff by making Canada an entrepot for European contraband. A Commercial Union which would abolish the Customs line, he says, we can have whenever we please, and without prejudice to our political relations, no change in which, in his opinion, would be rendered necessary by a purely commercial Union. He points with good reason to the Fisheries dispute as an important part of the matter: it is pretty sure before long to bring theese question to a head.

Among the alterations of the Tariff there is one of a most ominous kind—the increase of the duty on coal. This, as the Finance Minister avows, is intended as a sort of forcing-pump, to drive the use of Nova Scotian coal up as far as Toronto, and

if possible, as far as Hamilton. It is a desperate expedient adopted for the purpose of giving Nova Scotia an artificial interest in a system in which she has no natural interest, because commercially she is not identified with the western parts of the Dominion. With respect to its general provisions, the Tariff might pass as a revenue tariff; it certainly has not raised more money than the revenue required; but this increase of the coal duty is protection, positive and undisguised. It will, of course, diminish the revenue by the amount of duty now paid on coal as far west as the Nova Scotian coal is forced. Let a hard winter come; let Ontario seriously feel the inhanced price of fuel, and Sir Leonard Tilley's tariff will be in peril. The coal tax is the clamp by which he binds the Provinces fiscally together; let the clamp be removed and a break-up will probably ensue.

—But still more ominous is the announcement by the Finance Minister of his intention to increase, or take power to increase, the amount of his issue of paper without increasing his reserve. This is not a Currency measure, and the advocates of Fiat money need not flatter themselves that it is. It is, in effect, a forced loan, and like all such loans, is likely, while it seems cheap, to prove in the end far dearer than borrowing in the regular way. The Finance Minister would no doubt be startled and shocked if he were told that he had taken the first step in a calamitous descent; yet a careful survey of financial history will show him that such is the certain verdict of experience. He thinks that when he wants gold he will be able to get it at New York; but it is precisely when you want gold, unluckily, that it is not to be got. He thinks, also, that he can fix the limit beyond which inflation shall not go; but he has no control over his successors, who may be, and indeed are pretty sure to be, in greater straits than himself. His measure, though he would not like to admit it, involves a breach of faith to the holders of existing notes, who have taken

them on the assurance of their being secured by a certain reserve. If a Bank were to do the same thing, its conduct would be deemed fraudulent, and it would be restrained by law. That it can be restrained by law and compelled under penalties to keep faith with its bill-holders is the great advantage which a Bank has, as a medium for paper circulation, over any Government and especially one which is always liable to fall into the hands of unscrupulous politicians. A Government with an obedient majority can always set itself free from its engagements; it can always by declaring its bad paper a legal tender force it into circulation, and thus despoil those who are compelled to take the paper for the debts due them. It can, in fact, commit fraud and robbery pretty much at its pleasure; and we know from abundant instances, both in the Old World and in the New, that neither by dishonest kings, nor by dishonest demagogues will the power be allowed to remain unused. Issuing bank bills is no more part of the necessary duty of a Government than issuing cheques or promissory notes; nothing is a part of the necessary duty of a Government but stamping the coin of the realm: the English Government does not issue bank bills, it charters a particular bank, which is an institution distinct from the Government, though employed by it, and is really and effectively subject to the law. A wisely-framed Constitution, especially in such communities as ours, instead of directing the Government to issue all the paper money, would perhaps restrain it from issuing any paper money at all.

—The power of raising revenue by Customs exhausted; a deficit of quite uncertain amount still remaining; recourse had to a forced loan under the guise of inflating the currency; a public debt heavy and steadily increasing; an undertaking, with the limit of our resources thus close in sight, to build a railway across the Continent, for the purpose of incorporating a Province with ten or fifteen thousand inhabitants, in the teeth of

engineering difficulties wholly unmeasured, at a cost literally unfathomable and without any rational hope of return—surely these are things which ought to make the nation pause and reflect. We say advisedly the nation. This is not a party question, nor is either Party in a position to charge the other with having brought us into our present situation. If Sir John Macdonald signed the fatal bond Mr. Mackenzie sealed it, though he betrayed, by the trembling of his hand, his consciousness of the character of the compact. Conventional opinion on the subject of "the great national enterprise" has prevailed in public over the individual misgivings which all along have been expressed in private; and even in the press persistent protest has been confined almost to a single pen. Grit journalists who are now beginning to speak against the Pacific Railway, acquiesced in the enterprise, or actually supported it, while it was being carried on by a Minister of their own party. Recriminations are out of place; reflections on the past are useless; all our public men have the same interest in the welfare of the country which they govern; let them all alike at this moment of evident peril, give her patriotic counsel and try to save her from irretrievable disaster.

Few of our people, we venture to say, clearly see the nature of the enterprise in which we are embarked, its real object, or the relation of that object to the special interests of Canada. Great Britain possesses on this Continent four distinct territories: the Maritime Provinces, Canada Proper, the North-West, and British Columbia. These territories are respectively separated from the Continent to the south of them merely by a diplomatic line, which losses incurred through the adverse construction of ill-drawn treaties have rendered even more untenable than it originally was. They are separated from each other, in all cases, by wide distances, while Canada is cut off from the North-West by a vast tract of irreclaimable wilderness, and the North-West from Manitoba by the most tremendous barriers of nature. But we have undertaken, under Imperial inspiration, to turn these four territories into one, and

to sever them from the rest of the Continent, by a series of stupendous railways, to be built at the expense of the Eastern Provinces, particularly of Ontario, which, being the rich partner, pays heavily for all. Our main object in doing this is political and Imperial, not commercial, as the railway already built between the Maritime Provinces and Canada mournfully proclaims, though it is instinctively felt that without community and privity of commercial interest, the political partnership will not long endure. Let it be granted that commercial sacrifices, and great commercial sacrifices, may often be rightly made for a political object. Let it be granted, also, that the political object in the present case—the foundation of an anti-democratic Empire on this democratic Continent—is both good and feasible, as many able and worthy men believe it to be. All that we here maintain is that the political object cannot be secured by means which entail financial ruin. To what political goal financial ruin will bring Canada is not doubtful. Those who are accused of plotting Annexation have little need to plot; they have only to be quiet and let the Railway policy run its course.

In the Intercolonial Railway thirty-six millions have been sunk, and though the annual losses have, for the time, been reduced by a sacrifice of the efficiency of the road, they will probably amount, on the average, to at least half a million. This is to us fully what a loss of four hundred millions would be to the United States. In a commercial point of view, the road is an admitted failure. Military men say that it is equally so from their point of view. People are already beginning to talk of its abandonment, and when a far shorter route is open, as it soon must be, though through the States, it is not impossible that our Government may find itself compelled to stop a scandalous waste by winding up the concern. Next comes the railway round the north shore of Lake Superior, which is to form the bond of union between Canada and the North-West. To talk of a water-way, frozen half the year, imposing on trade two trans-shipments, and sure to be seized by the enemy in

case of war, as the ultimate connection, seems absurd. Built, the railway round Lake Superior must be, if the North-West is to be really incorporated with Canada; but when it is to be built, and how the money is to be provided, are questions which the Minister of Railways seems unwilling to approach. Practical men, when you can get at their real opinion, speak of the undertaking as desperate. As to the railway through the mountains from the North-West to British Columbia, let Sir Charles Tupper only state explicitly the engineering difficulties to be encountered, the probable cost of construction, the probable cost of running the line under such conditions of climate, and the probable or possible returns, direct or indirect—then let him lay his hand upon his Star of Knighthood, and aver, if he can, that this enterprise, with our limited resources, is anything but an act of madness. At present it is the very height of madness; for until the connection with Manitoba has been formed by carrying the railroad round Lake Superior, everything beyond, so far as we are concerned, will be in the air.

As to the opening up of Manitoba in itself, it is a boon to humanity. Whether it is a boon to Canada specially depends immediately on the adequacy of the land sales to supply the price of the works; and this again depends, to a great extent, on the value of wheat, over-production of which is, at least, a possibility. If Canada has to pay out of her own pocket for Manitoba railways she will have been paying for the loss of her best farmers and the depreciation of her farms and produce: this she is beginning to see. That by protective tariffs, or any political machinery that can be devised, she will be enabled permanently to keep to herself a monopoly of the North-Western trade, if the commercial interest of the settlers carries it in any other direction, few can be sanguine enough to believe. Manitoba is now a child; you may deal with her and tie her up at your pleasure: but as soon as she begins to get strong and to think for herself, especially if her population is mixed, she will vote your ordinances down at Ottawa, or fling them to the winds, consult her own interests

and trade with whomsoever she thinks fit. Let the "illimitable wilderness" fill up, and the old Provinces will be reduced to political as well as agricultural insignificance.

With regard to the Railway policy, as with regard to the general expenditure of the country, there has been a false glamour over the situation which has prevented our people from seeing things as they were. The country has been in a state of visionary exaltation, produced by the subtle working on the national mind and character of the Imperial idea, as well as by the incessant streams of exaggerative rhetoric which men in high places think it their duty to vie with each other in pouring forth. Such speeches as those of which the late Governor-General made a long and eloquent series, uttered to the people, are not merely innocuous flummery; they mislead and they intoxicate. Every farmer and trader in the country is persuaded that he has a vast future before him, so that he may mortgage himself as deeply as he pleases; and the collective result is seen in our rushing into a railway enterprise the cost of which is boundless before we had determined, or even surveyed, the route. Old Canada, with the Maritime Provinces, is nearly a counterpart of New England with Maine; she has, like New England, a territory, not very rich, but inhabited by a race admirably fitted for every kind of industry; in extent, she is superior to New England, in wealth probably inferior. It is open to her people, if they are prudent, to enjoy the same sort of happiness which the people of New England enjoy; the highest, that is taking all things and all classes together, which is enjoyed by any community in the world. But this is on condition of their cutting their coat according to their cloth: if they do not, the nation will have a fine collar and fine cuffs, while the back of the garment will be wanting; it will have a grand system of Imperial railways without daily bread.

At all events let us die in the light, as the warrior of old prayed he might do. Let the Government before it plunges with the country into what may prove a gulf of ruin, distinctly lay before the people the engineering details of the

Pacific Railway through its whole line; state the estimated cost, and specify the sources from which the money is to be provided. If the nation then deliberately assents to the undertaking, there is no more to be said. But the question has never yet been fairly brought before the country.

—The key-note of Sir Alexander Galt's parting speech at Montreal is to be found in his description of the kindred communities to the south of us "as a hostile, or if not hostile, at least an unfriendly nation." In pursuance of this Jingo fancy, for it really is nothing else, Canada is to be divorced economically from the Continent, of which nature has made her economically as well as geographically a part, and to be incorporated by an Imperial Zollverein with Great Britain, South Africa, and Australia. There is no man who, looking coolly at the question from a commercial point of view, does not see that this scheme is a chimera and must fail. The Colonies will not be induced to surrender the liberty of commercial legislation which they have won; the English people will not be induced, even under a Tory Government, to increase their financial deficit by voting money for the raising of wheat in Manitoba, when food is coming to them in abundance from all parts of the globe. Nor will the British artisan be persuaded that a half loaf is as good as a whole one because the wheat grows under his own flag: he emigrates without the slightest compunction whenever his interest bids him to the United States, and why should he spit out American bread? The result of this policy, if it is long persisted in, will be the impoverishment of Canada, and the result of that again will be compulsory political annexation instead of free commercial union. Let us hope that a short experiment will be enough.

—We said that Protectionism was likely soon to receive a blow in Victoria. The blow has fallen; the Protectionist

Ministry of Mr. Berry has been beaten at the polls. Other issues were mixed with the Tariff; there was a general struggle between the "squatter" aristocracy and the more democratic elements, which had resulted in a constitutional deadlock caused by a collision of the usual kind between the Upper and the Lower House. But the Tariff was the main issue, and the Government was beaten by the discontent of the consumers. The catastrophe has been evidently approaching for the last two years. So it will be in the end wherever Protection is applied to a small community. The United States, it ought always to be remembered, are a self-sufficing Continent. Protection on the Continental scale may hold its own: on the small scale it never can. This will become more apparent as manufactures become more specialized, more scientific, more costly, and require, as a consequence, a larger market.

—Our treatment of the Fiat Money question has called forth some criticism, the courtesy of which, however, we are bound to acknowledge. We can do little more than re-state the very simple truths on which we take our stand. A bank bill is an order for gold, payable by the bank, whether private or national, on demand; and when we seem to buy goods with the bill, we really buy them not with the bill but with the gold for which the bill is an order. The paper itself would buy nothing. Let a currency theorist once lose his hold of this fact—let him once lapse into the belief that he buys his boots with paper—and he is lost. There is no knowing through what mazes he may wander, or to what undiscovered bourne of chimerical speculation he may at last come. Of course, there may be orders for other things besides gold, as in the case of the French Assignats, which were, in effect, orders for a share of certain lands. But those lands belonged to the Government. The "wealth of the country," on which it is proposed that the fiat currency shall be based, does not belong to the Government; and, therefore, the

Government can no more give an order for it, or for a share of it, than Mr. Buchanan can give an order for the property of Mr. Wallace. Where payment of Government bank bills has been suspended, the value retained by the bills has been in exact proportion to the hope of resumption. When that hope has expired, as it did in the case of the Confederate States on their final defeat, the bills have ceased to have any value whatever. Bills, upon their face irredeemable, would be valueless from the moment of their issue. They would be mere sheets of spoiled paper, which would be accepted in payment by no human being. The precious metals, one or both, are now the established standard of value and medium of exchange in all civilized countries, so that a nation which should discard them in favour of any other sort of money—iron, for example, or cowries,—would thereby cut itself off from commercial intercourse with the world. Whether it would gain by such excommunication would soon be seen. Bank bills are of the same nature as promissory notes, bonds, and other securities for money, and their issue is governed by the same rules of commercial morality. It is unfortunately true that a Government, when it assumes the issue of bank bills, possesses extraordinary facilities for fraud, of which the more unscrupulous Governments have taken advantage, to the ruin, first, of the holders of their securities, and afterwards of commerce; but the crime is the more, not the less, heinous because it is perpetrated by the appointed guardians of public credit and morality. When anyone, reputed to be of sound mind, talks of building the Pacific Railway with paper, it is charitable to suppose that he means landscrip. The railway may be built with landscrip if the land is of sufficient value; but this is not building with paper, it is building with the price of land which the purchaser pays in gold.

—Those who profess to believe that there reigns through Canada a blessed apathy with regard to all questions connected with our external relations, political and commercial, fail to

give what would be the best proof of the sincerity of their belief by holding their own peace. In the *North American Review* Sir Francis Hincks anxiously assures the people of the United States that it is useless to turn their eyes this way, since the efforts of agitators to create disaffection in this country, and to propagate a desire for commercial union, have proved wholly unavailing. Simple-minded as the Americans are, they have probably discernment enough to perceive that if Sir Francis Hincks had no reason for disquietude he would probably remain quiet. They may be also trusted to divine that when he stigmatizes the friends of commercial union as agitators and sowers of disaffection, he may be expressing the personal emotions of a Knight and an Imperial Pensioner rather than depicting actual facts. If talking or writing, however copiously, on the question of the day is agitation, it is to be feared that the Knight himself will hardly escape the brand. Mr. Bourinot, at the same time, sends to the Colonial Institute in London a paper on the 'National Development of Canada' which has received the attention due to the ability and knowledge of the writer. We cannot help thinking that the picture of Canadian prosperity and resources so often presented to English hearers and readers, though strictly and conscientiously accurate, must a little weary by its sameness, and that it would be almost a relief to them to be told of a Canadian Company which was not making vast profits, of a Canadian railway which was not paying the original stockholders ten per cent., or of a year in which the Finance Minister of Canada was not called upon to struggle with an overwhelming surplus. They might even, if there were any vestige of naughtiness in their hearts, like something to break the monotony of a loyalty, which, as represented by our essayists and officials, must recall to their minds a row of charity boys on a commemoration day full of buns and gratitude and reverence for the Trustees. Mr. Bourinot's fearless candour does indeed lead him to admit that "the idea that the time must come when Canada will take a place in the community of nations may obtain some currency among

the ambitious youth of the country." Well, boys will be boys—perhaps even Mr. Bourinot once was young.

—In Quebec, the political waters are still heaving and tossing like the sea under an uncertain wind. There are rumours of new coalitions, of a dissolution, of a disagreement between the Lieutenant-Governor and his ministers. The main cause of all this confusion is the financial embarrassment, not to say imminent insolvency, of a Province which at the same time is engaged, as a member of the Confederation, in building a prodigious railway for an object in which the English part of her population has no more interest, as Sir A. Galt truly says, than the farmers of Yorkshire or Tipperary, and the French part of her population hardly any interest at all. All hope of getting the Dominion Government to buy the North Shore Railway has vanished ; it is enough for the Dominion Government to have the Intercolonial on its hands. A back claim for a sum of money which it is alleged ought to have been paid to Quebec at the time of Confederation is the last resource ; no doubt the demand will be refused, and Quebec will be compelled to fall back upon that old Roman revenue, parsimony, and to vote for reduction of the cost of government and against railways to the moon. Complaints still reach us of dulness of business, and of want of employment, notwithstanding the revival of the lumber trade, though the sugar refineries at Montreal are unquestionably making immense gains. Similar complaints come from Nova Scotia, and still more loudly from New Brunswick. In the debate on the budget, Mr. Domville gallantly struggled to prove in the interest of his party that New Brunswick was growing prosperous under the National Policy, but the lack of material for his demonstration was painfully evident to a bystander ; in fact it was the case of Balaam's blessing sadly reversed. From St. John we are told the exodus of mechanics and young men is large every week, some finding their way to Boston and New York, but the greater number to the Western

States. An exodus from Quebec is going on at the same time. "A hostile or at least unfriendly nation"—why there will soon be as many Canadians on that side of the line as on this! The promotion of Emigration is one of the special objects of Sir Alex. Galt's mission. Before we think of promoting emigration from other countries, might it not be as well to study the means of keeping our own people at home? What can be more absurd than to be laboriously and expensively pumping in the stream of population, while from every quarter of the Dominion it is running out into the United States? Bunting will not stop the exodus: buncombe will not stop it: nothing will stop it but prosperity; and prosperity is only to be secured by embracing a commercial policy which, instead of being manifestly condemned, is dictated and seconded by nature.

In New Brunswick, however, at this moment the burning question seems to be the transfer of the Provincial Capital from Fredericton to St. John. Considering the condition of the finances, it might have been thought that a reduction of the cost of government by a union with the other Maritime Provinces would have had the first claim to attention. But supposing this to be out of the question, there can surely be little doubt of the expediency of placing the seat of government in the social and commercial centre. The opposite policy has everywhere proved a failure, in Canada as well as in the United States. Legislators, rural legislators especially, require the education of contact with various interests, and the tempering influence of general society. The evils arising from the absence of these advantages are not less conspicuous at Ottawa than at Albany. As to the danger of mob control in a city, it is, if not imaginary, far too slight to turn the scale.

—The Ontario Legislature has risen after once more proving, by the magnitude of the machinery and the smallness of the result, that to draw a cork with a steam engine is a waste of money and power. We assume that the Union is not merely Federal

but National; that the Dominion Legislature is supreme; such, we conceive, is the established doctrine; it is implied at least whenever we are told that the Dominion is to be governed in accordance with the principles of the British Constitution. On this hypothesis, it would seem that supreme legislation on all subjects, civil and criminal alike, ought to be assigned to the Dominion Parliament; that the functions of the Local Legislatures ought to be limited to local affairs, including, of course, the management of the Provincial purse; and that the multiplication of petty Parliaments, with all their paraphernalia, and with a Constitutional King to read speeches from the Throne to each of them, is a legislative evil as well as a pecuniary waste. On the opposite hypothesis, which we do not mean to exclude from view, the Dominion Parliament ought to be confined to federal duties, which, as a group of dependencies can have no foreign policy, would be light; and the power of legislation on all domestic subjects ought to be restored to the Provincial Parliaments, which in that case would, no doubt, attract back to them sufficient statesmanship for such work. The duplicate set of institutions which at present exists is not likely to outlast the first sharp pinch of financial difficulty. The Government of Quebec is now well-nigh bankrupt; and if Mr. Mowat does not admit that the Ontario surplus is rapidly dwindling, Mr. Mackenzie does.

One thing more the Ontario Legislature, in the late Session, has done. It has shown the possibility of getting on, at all events, without Party; for the Opposition, though it tried to keep up the farce, was nothing. The result was a freedom of thought and speech which showed itself with advantage to the public, both on the question of aid to railways and on that of the proposed grant to Upper Canada College. In Manitoba they have got through a Session without even the semblance of an Opposition, and the same feat may soon be performed in New Brunswick. Perhaps it may be said with regard to Manitoba that men who go forth on the Prairie leave narrow traditions behind. At all events, those who contend that the system of

Government by Party is an inseparable portion and an inherent need of our political nature will be constrained to qualify their theory so far as to exempt Provincial legislatures. Free and honest counsel is a good thing—it is deemed so in the general affairs of the world—but it is out of the question where the party system prevails. Listen to the debate about our Fiscal policy in the Parliament at Ottawa; the charge of two regiments against each other might as well be called deliberation.

Mr. Fennings Taylor and Mr. Watson have been maintaining with well-matched ability and learning the opposite sides of the question whether Local Legislatures are Parliaments. Mr. Watson, who maintains the affirmative, thinks that he has driven his adversaries to admit, as the logical consequence of their heretical principles, that the Provinces must be independent Republics. To avoid this appalling conclusion we would gladly waive all objections to the fancy dresses of the Speaker and the Serjeant-at-arms, or to the title of M.P.P. But it greatly concerns the lieges that the Local Assemblies, be they Legislatures or Parliaments, should never be allowed to forget that they are not sovereign, but creatures of the law, and amenable to the Courts of Law if they exceed their jurisdiction, whether in matters of taxation or on any other matter. This was clearly not borne in mind by the apparently inspired apologist of the Extra Session, who wished to insinuate that the question as to the legality of the assumption had been closed against further discussion by the action of the Legislature itself.

—By voting itself a new mansion the Ontario Legislature has given us the opportunity of perpetrating a great public building. It must be said that the Mother Country has done her best to encourage us. In Trafalgar Square, one of the finest city sites in Europe is occupied by the National Gallery, with a facade of unspeakable meanness, surmounted by an inverted slopbowl. The pile at Westminster, though imposing by dint of its magnitude and its lofty towers, is covered with ornament

at once extremely feeble, and sure, from its delicacy, to be reduced to a sheet of blackness and corrosion by the smoke, while the interior totally belies the promise of amplitude and majesty which the colossal size of the exterior holds out. So if the Colony fails she is not without excuse. An unfortunate bias, we cannot help thinking, was given to our public architecture by the taste, superior no doubt in itself, which planned the Parliament Buildings at Ottawa, and the University of Toronto, because, while those buildings are sufficiently successful to form alluring examples, neither of them is in a style at all suited to the Canadian climate, and suitableness to climate in architecture is the indispensable condition not only of utility but of genuine beauty. A Gothic pile, with the variety of forms and outlines in which its charm resides, or an Elizabethan manor-house, with its many gables, must in Canada be a mere snow trap. An arctic winter, with a heavy snow fall, and a tropical summer, are the conditions for which the Canadian architect is called upon to provide, and the claims of winter are by far the more imperious. They render necessary a simple roof with large eaves; and the eaves, as a special feature, seem to court the touch of decorative genius. The site for the new buildings has been determined by economy: it is a pity, on grounds of taste as well as of convenience, that it should be out of the city, which public edifices ought to adorn. Care should be taken not to come into too close a juxtaposition with the University. Great buildings in groups please the eye by their variety and richness; in pairs they kill each other.

—By the kind influence of the Governor-General and his Consort, a large collection of Canadian paintings, drawings and designs has been gathered in the Exhibition at Ottawa, and the attendance has been fair, though it will be much larger when the exhibition leaves the Polar solitudes and comes to Toronto or Montreal. The duty of criticism has been abundantly performed by the Art critics of our journals, whose

decisions we most willingly accept. A picture of a Norwegian Fiord, by Norman, lent to the Exhibition by Mr. Gilmor, points out to our landscape painters the goal which a group of them, headed by their President, with his "Morning on the Saguenay," have made worthy efforts to attain. This picture of the Fiord is one of those which every one would like to have hanging in his own room. It gives not only the material features, but the sentiment of the landscape, and is a good example of the right use of figures, which are often introduced merely for the sake of pictorial effect, like a patch on a fine lady's face. The scene, though in its summer guise, lies evidently within the realms of winter, who has relaxed his hold but has not let it go: so much we learn from the snow lingering far down in the shady clefts of the rocks; and the aspect of the little hamlet cowering under a protecting knoll tells the same tale. The whole population of the hamlet is abroad on the land or on the water making the most of its brief summer. A pic-nic party in the foreground suggests at once the pleasantness of the day and the beauty of the view which the party has come to enjoy; while the man's telescope turned to the cliffs excites our fancy with the idea of something moving, or some little mystery of distance, among the lonely crags. The steamboat coming out from the background denotes the length and windings of the Fiord, the portion of which in view might otherwise be mistaken for a rock-bound cove. A large sea-piece, taken off Gibraltar, is also full of naval life, and of the freshness and buoyancy of the sea. In the unambitious line of Flowers we may look with complacency on the productions of our native artists, including, of course, those of Mr. Fowler, who had much better not waste himself upon dead ducks. Over a salmon, freshly landed, plays something of the light of life, and there is about it a suggestion of sport; a dead duck is suggestive of nothing but sage and onions; an artist might as well paint his hat.

When a man possesses a painting "said to be" by a great master, why should he dispel the happy illusion for ever by sending his treasure to an Exhibition? We see instances of this

unwisdom in every loan collection. Of the genuineness of the Turner lent by Mr. Reynolds we have no doubt, though the picture is in the declining manner of the master. Apart from the Turneresque treatment of the atmosphere and of particular objects, notably the trees, the aim of the picture, as a whole, is evidently that characteristic of Turner: it is, as that of all high landscape painting must be, the Poetic and not the Picturesque. No one whose aim was the Picturesque would have introduced that long monotonous row of modern, vulgar, and so far as we can see through the haze, rather seedy houses which runs across the picture, inhancing by contrast the romance of the Cathedral soaring up behind. To seek not the Picturesque but the Poetic is the great lesson taught by the works of Turner: unfortunately it is one which genius alone can learn.

While we are on the subject of art, we may notice a pretty little industry which no doubt has been called into existence by the N. P., and which consists in the illumination by hand of little printed books. "The Ribbon Series," as it is named, seems not unlikely to furnish to some ladies skilled in painting an employment too often sorely needed. The style would be applicable to many things, calendars for example. It has sometimes occurred to us that a Wedding Album, nicely illuminated, and inscribed with the names of all the friends, might be a memorial of the wedding day not less appropriate or interesting than the nondescript bazaar which brides are so proud to show, and in the contributions to which the rich, as usual, are glorified and the poor are put to shame.

—Are the Building Societies purely beneficent channels of fertilizing capital, or "incorporated harpies?" These are the two sides of the shield which have been held up, one by the *Globe*, and the other by the *Mail*. It may safely be said that the truth lies nearer to the more favourable extreme. Advances of money on a large scale were indispensable. Without them farms could not be improved, houses and barns built, or

machines and other means of high cultivation provided; and nobody, not even a Granger, will advance money without interest, and interest at the current rate. The only question is, whether the current rate of interest shall be high or low, the borrower, of course, wishing it to be low; and there can be no sort of doubt that the Building Societies, by their competition, and by bringing in foreign money, have lowered it, and are lowering it still. Dr. Orton, in moving to limit interest to 7 per cent., is legislating to make rivers run down hill. The rate of interest in this country is but little more than 7 per cent. at present, and will soon be less. Money is becoming cheaper every day. The general fact, then, is that the Building Societies have brought relief, and great relief, to the borrower. That they have themselves prospered, is no proof that they have not done good; though it was sure to make them objects of envy, which is the food of demagogism and the poison of democracy. But not all of them have prospered; if, instead of taking the profits of the most successful, we were to take their average profits, their success would hardly be found to exceed the common measure of commercial speculation; and while some of them have in the good years formed rests which would carry them through bad years, there are others which, having divided all their profits, would scarcely survive one or two short harvests.

It can hardly be necessary at this time of day to set about proving that to take interest for money is not in itself unlawful. A spends $1,000 in building a house, which he lets to B at a rent which will bring him 8 per cent. on the outlay. C lends D $1,000 to build a house with, taking 8 per cent. on the loan. How does one of these transactions differ, morally or socially, from the other? How does either of them differ from any other transaction which is governed by the ordinary laws of commerce, and in which each party takes all that he can fairly get? Money is a commodity, the trade in which is like the trade in any other commodity, and equally moral, provided it be carried on with honesty. A stockholder in any

company whatever, and not only a stockholder, but any one who takes profit or wages instead of giving his goods or labour gratis, is just as much a "harpy" as a member of a Building Society. That there is such a thing as the practice of wicked and extortionate usury cannot be denied; but there are wickedness and extortion in other branches of trade also, though the money trade happens to lend itself particularly to the rapacious arts of Shylock. These are economical truths which hardly anybody now denies in theory, and of which everybody, even the most highflying sentimentalist, takes the benefit in practice. Yet Mosaic traditions and mediæval fancies still cling to us. A legislator can still get up in the Parliament of a commercial community and propose to fix a maximum of interest. He ought to propose at the same time to fix a minimum of security, unless he expects people to have no regard to the value of the security on which their money is advanced. Practically his Bill, if it could possibly be carried into effect, would amount to a confiscation of the property of one section of society for the benefit of another section, since it matters nothing whether you forcibly take away a part of a man's principal, or reduce his claim for interest. It is a great pity that in politics the possibilities of experiment are so limited, and that there is not some field on which these fancies can be tried without flinging a whole community into confusion. Projectors would then receive a satisfaction which the plainest demonstration will never afford. They may, however, learn something from the experience of the past. The effect of usury laws has invariably been to raise the rate of interest by adding the risk of illegality to the ordinary risks; and in the Middle Ages the consequence of forbidding Christians to lend money at interest was that the people fell into the merciless fangs of a horde of extortionate Jews.

On the other hand, it would be a mistake, we fear, to think that the good done by the Building Societies has been attended by no evil. Unquestionably, the facilities for borrowing in Canada, of late years, have been far too great, and advantage

has been taken of them by the farmers to a very large and probably dangerous extent. A demand has been made, in the course of this controversy, for an enquiry into the system of the Societies: it would reveal little, we suspect, but what is already known from their rules and tables or from the law of mortgagor and mortgagee; but an enquiry into the extent of farm and other property under mortgage might reveal some very startling and momentous facts. It might show that the Loan Societies are, in fact, the landlords of Canada. So long as borrowing is perfectly spontaneous, it is not likely to be excessive: it is when loans are thrust upon the people, that the mischief begins; and this, no doubt, is often done by the agents of Building Societies for the sake of the commission. It is not unlikely that the Tables, by their ambiguous terms, may sometimes lead to deception, and thus to extortion, against which legislation might properly guard. At the same time the Building Societies are often the victims of fraud on the part of agents who are corrupted, or of farmers who put a false value on their land, by means of collusive sales or fictitious assessments. The result is unquestionably a vast mass of indebtedness, and in case of bad harvests, or an extensive emigration to Manitoba from the farms under mortgage, the Building Societies would be in danger of finding a good many of their securities on their hands.

Under these circumstances, it is not wonderful that quack nostrums, and even worse things than quack nostrums—whispered suggestions of legalized repudiation—should find dangerous currency among the indebted, who, under the galling pressure of their own burdens, can hardly be expected to see that, in a commercial community all are creditors as well as debtors, and that it would avail the farmer little to be enabled to lift his mortgage with fiat paper, if the value of his farm and of its produce was to be lifted at the same time. Real relief, we repeat once more, is coming in its natural form. Money is growing cheaper, and the rate of interest is falling. Only a line which, economically speaking, is purely artificial, divides us

from a community in which the rate is already a good deal lower than it is here. As we write, the case comes under our notice of a mortgage on a Canadian farm to a Building Society at 8 per cent. lifted by a loan at 6 per cent. on a property which the mortgagor happened to hold at Detroit. The debt is at once reduced a quarter by merely going to a money market a few miles off. Can N. C. do much better for the indebted farmer than that?

—In the United States everybody and everything are still full of the Presidential election and the Third Term. It is a great evil, and in itself a strong condemnation of such an institution as the elective Presidency, at least with the party system, that for two or three years out of every four, the mind of the nation should be absorbed by a bitter faction fight instead of being turned to any object truly national or to any effort for the common good. The character of a community of political angels would not long survive such a training in mutual hatred. As to the probable result we find the utmost diversity of opinions, not only among party journals and speakers, who predict what they desire, but among well-informed and cool-headed men, uttering in private their sincere belief. Some think that Grant is an evident impossibility and that he will not get the nomination; others again that he will be nominated but not elected; others that, if nominated, he must certainly be elected. The reason given for the last opinion is ominous; supposing Grant to be nominated, it is said his election will be necessary to the peace of the country. Why should the peace of the country be endangered if General Grant is rejected at the polls? What is it imagined, in that case, that his partisans will do? Of one thing we feel pretty sure; Grant, in spite of all that has been said about his standing on his dignity, will accept the nomination whether it be unanimous or not. As we read his character he is free from criminal ambition and wholly incapable of the military usurpation which the nervous fancy of

some of his opponents deems possible. But he is not self-denying or fastidious: he would take anything, from an empire to a jack-knife, in whatever way it might be offered. There is a vigorous revolt against him and his Machine among the purer and more independent Republicans, who have appeared in force not only in New York but in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, wisely refraining from naming a candidate of their own, like the ill-starred Cincinnati Convention, but putting their veto on those whom they deem unworthy. These men protest against Blaine as well as against Grant. Whether they succeed on this occasion or not, their movement, being vigorous and sustained, as it appears to be, is the best augury for the liberation of the country from the accursed thraldom of organized faction. It is hardly the less so because some, and perhaps most, of those engaged, appear still to be unconscious that their aim must be the abolition of faction, and that they will in vain seek by purification to make it a power of good. They will find at last that there is something in the blackamoor which no washing can make white. It is not the Machinists that are to blame. Considering what a trade they ply, it is wonderful the Machinists are not worse: the evil is the existence of the Machine, and a Machine every faction must have. It is in watching the gradual progress of the public mind towards a perception of this truth that the chief interest of American politics at present lies. A mortal race is being run between growing wisdom and the demoralizing influence of party for the very existence of the Republic.

An unlucky thing has happened. Mr. Bayard is a statesman of irreproachable character, and has proved his courage by taking the strongest line in favour of honest money, while the less scrupulous section of his party was forming alliances with the Greenbackers. For him, if the Democrats had nominated him against Grant, the better Republicans might have voted on personal grounds, and the effect would have been excellent in every way. But a speech made by him in 1861, against the coercion of the South, has been unearthed, and is pronounced fatal to his "availability." Nothing can be more ridiculous, but such is the game.

The advocates of a Third Term pretend to believe that it would be no change of the Constitution. On this point, perhaps, the judgment of dispassionate onlookers is as likely to be true as that of enthusiastic partisans. Were a civilian re-elected for administrative merit, there would merely be a breach of a tradition too long established to be lightly broken. But if a soldier were re-elected, not for administrative merit, of which General Grant is notoriously devoid, but as a "strong man," in other words, as a military ruler and possible dictator, to say that there was no change of the Constitution would be absurd. There might be none of its letter but there would be a serious change of its spirit. Nor do the more outspoken of the Third Termers shrink from avowing that they are for a fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh term as well as for a third. In other words, they are in favour of a military Presidency for life, which after the long disuse of election, might pass more easily into dynasticism than they imagine. If society can be saved from confusion only by a man on horseback, a man on horseback it must have; but let it at least see what it is doing.

—In the meantime San Francisco has been the scene of a revolution which seems to show that so far as the danger of Sandlot anarchy is concerned, a man on horseback may not be so needful after all. The swelling waterspout of the Kearney agitation has been burst, if the affair is reported correctly, by a very small shot. Kearney has suddenly and completely succumbed; he has been arrested by a policeman for using threatening language, taken before a magistrate, convicted and sentenced, submitting as quietly as a lamb. This seems miraculous; but the miracle was probably performed by the appearance on the scene of the Citizens' Protective Union; in other words, of a powerful Vigilance Committee which practically superseded the Kearneyite authorities of San Francisco, and took the city into its hands. Still the complete and apparently easy overthrow of this conspirator and his gang proves that the remedial

forces are yet strong, and that resolution is not wanting to call them forth at need. When a conflict takes place between the rich and the poor there is generally a good deal to be said for the poor; but Kearney deserved no such sympathy; he was a brutal and foul-mouthed ruffian; and his victory would have brought no reform or measure of justice, but simply a plundering anarchy, and very likely a hideous massacre of the Chinese.

—It seems not unlikely that there may be high words—we may be very sure that there will be nothing worse—between America and Europe about the Panama Canal. The United States think that they too are a great power, and that they must emulate the pretensions and jealousies of the great powers of the old world. England asserts a complete control over the Suez Canal; she assumes authority to exempt it from the range of war, even when Egypt is a belligerent; more than this, she proclaims that her possession of India carries with it a claim to a "satisfactory right of way"; and that the rights of all communities on the route, even their rights to national existence, must be held subject to that claim. She can hardly be surprised if the United States so far follow her example as to assert their interest in a canal with which they have at least as much of a territorial connection as she has with that of Suez. If the great highways of commerce were left alone by all the Powers, they would, perhaps, not be in much danger: a civilized community, especially one of the mercantile class, would hardly feel more inclination to destroy or close them than a respectable householder feels to tear up the sidewalk or cut the gas main. But it is the fashion to act on the assumption that everybody is a brigand; and we plead guilty to enough of Continental feeling to make us not sorry that a check should be put on the habit of treating the communities of the New World as though they stood on an inferior footing and had scarcely a legitimate existence.

—In Europe the state of things is a standing "scare." There is no use in attending to the mere reports or guesses of newspaper correspondents who are bound to have something to tell. Bismarck, in his unconventional and postprandial fashion, has been speaking of the sensational reports in the London *Times* as inserted for stock-jobbing purposes; though it may be remarked by the way, that the scarcity of investments in England is now so great that the holders of Consols are not likely to sell out from alarm, and consequently the pulse of public opinion is hardly felt in the funds. The only things really worth attention are the actual doings of the Powers, and the motives by which each is likely to be influenced. The German army has been increased; but it seems inconceivable that Germany should intend to attack Russia, or that Russia should intend to attack Germany. Germany feels herself watched all the time by the gleaming eye of vengeful France; and it appears likely that the ostensible fear of Russian aggression is an excuse given to the groaning German Parliament for the increase of armaments, rather than the real motive. There is nothing that Germany could take from Russia but Courland. Denmark or Holland, to the annexation of which by Germany, Russia would no doubt for an adequate consideration assent, might be deemed a more tempting prize; and in truth some grand "rectification" of this kind, Germany taking Denmark or Holland, and France Belgium, is about the most probable out-come of this vast embroglio of bloated armaments. With Holland Germany is already bickering, because the Dutch, as she alleges, have been stealing some of her soldiers to fight the Achinese in Sumatra, who appear to be as tough as the Zulus. Between Russia and England, on the other hand, the feeling grows daily more bitter, and it is probable that nothing stands in the way of war but the precarious life of the Czar, who has been for peace from the beginning, and if he had been trusted and treated with decency, instead of being suspected and insulted, would probably have saved humanity from a cataclysm of blood and misery. The nations of the remotest East, are now being drawn into the fatal vortex.

England incites China to attack Russia, Russia incites Japan to attack China; the people of those two great Empires may soon be slaughtering each other for European objects of which not a single Chinaman or Japanese has the least idea. The world is still a good way from the Age of Reason or the Millennium.

In France the rejection by the Senate of the Anti-Jesuit clause of the Education Bill has compelled the Republican Government to fall back on a standing law against the Jesuits; and we are apparently about to see another episode in the strange history of that dreaded order.

—It was thought by leading politicians in England that Parliament would meet only to be sent to the country. This did not seem to us likely. For the Prime Minister, in his seventy-sixth year, there could be no new lease of power, whatever there might be for his younger colleagues, and for him it seemed the natural course, without risking the chances of an election, to let the Parliament run out and then retire from the stage with the applause of his party. On the other hand, it was pretty clear that the Session could not be a long one. After the fierce fire of mutual invective which had rolled through the recess, the members met more in the mood for battle than for deliberation; to hold them to ordinary business while they were all engaged in a canvass would have been impossible; control over the House had plainly been lost by its leader, and could hardly have been retained even by a stronger man on the eve of a general election. Supposing the Government to feel tolerably confident of success, it was likely that the first crisis would bring on the Dissolution. The crisis has come in the shape of the scandalous miscarriage of a Government Bill for the purchase of the London Water Works; the Home Rule agitation, at the same moment, furnishes a pretext for an electioneering attack on those who have pursued a policy of justice towards Ireland; and the dice come rattling on the board from the box which has been so long suspended in the

hand of Lord Beaconsfield. There is an obvious effort at the last to give the dissolution a theatrical air of mystery and surprise. From the lofty statesmanship of Chatham and Pitt, of Canning and Peel, England has passed to an admiration of what Lord Salisbury once denounced as legerdemain and of the histrionic genius which launches "bolts out of the blue."

Mr. Gladstone, by his impulsive appeal to the country in 1874, not only showed his usual lack of party strategy, but set an example of a misuse, as we cannot but deem it, of the prerogative of dissolution, on which his adversaries were sure to improve. Parliamentary Government will be in danger of disorganization if Parliaments, instead of sitting for their legal term, or until the occurrence of a difference on some serious question between them and the Government renders an appeal to the country necessary, are to be liable to dissolution whenever the Government thinks there is a good chance of gaining a victory in the elections. Legislation may degenerate into manœuvring to gain the wind; the independence of members may be shaken by a continual menace; and there is no saying to what extent an unscrupulous Ministry may prolong its tenure of office by snapping a new lease whenever its electioneering agents advise it that the hour is propitious for that game. For the last two years, at least, England has been kept practically in the ferment of an election, while legislation has proceeded, and the National Council has held its life, subject to the confidential reports received from a set of roguish attorneys who are paid for telling the Government Whip how the cat jumps. We commend the point to the notice of Mr. Todd and other hierophants of the mysteries of the Constitution.

It was imagined that the Tories would be influenced by a desire to be rid of the Ballot, the Act for which expires at the end of the year. But the Ballot, though it was one of the Five Points of the Charter, has done the Liberals no more good than the Tories. If it has hurt the Tories by somewhat loosening the hold of the rich man over his dependents, it has hurt the Liberals at least as much, by giving free play to all

the sectional divergences and eccentricities which prevail among them, as well as to the mutual jealousies of the different grades of artisans. It has shaken the influence of the Trade Unions perhaps not less than that of the employer. Some Tories, in fact, more far-sighted than their fellows, recommended the party to embrace it on these grounds. Where the Ballot is really secret its general effect must be more and more to baffle combinations and render the result uncertain by bringing out the tendencies of the individual voter, whether he be swayed by conviction, by self-interest, by fancy, or by pique. At the last general election in this country, thousands must have promised their votes to the Grits and given them to the N. P.

A Liberal who is not in the fray may scan its chances almost as calmly as an uninterested spectator. Those who believe that the Jingo policy is bringing England to peril and disgrace, are bound to fight against it, and no doubt, like Englishmen, they will fight hard: but it is doubtful whether a well-advised friend of their cause would desire for them such a victory as would place them in power. That they should retain sufficient strength to be a real check on the Government, and to be ready to act with effect when the hour comes, is indispensable from the Opposition point of view; but a majority might be a curse in disguise. The country has been committed to a foreign policy comprising, on one hand, the maintenance and regeneration of the Ottoman Empire; on the other, the forcible repression of Russia along the whole line, and at the hourly peril of war. The passions of a large portion of the English people have been fiercely stirred, while Russia has been exasperated, not only by hostile acts, but by a torrent of insults. Immediate retreat from such a position is hardly possible without humiliation, which would fall upon the hapless heirs of a wrath treasured up by others, as it did in the case of the Treaty of Washington, the authors of which bore the shame which in justice belonged to the abettors of the *Alabama*. "Wait till the hot fit is over, till the hopelessness of galvanizing the Ottoman Empire into life has been proved to the satisfaction of all; till angry

fancy has ceased to take Russia for the only power of evil in the world, and to see her perfidious legions sailing with their artillery in balloons over the peaks of the Himalayas: then come back to Philip sober with the Indian policy of Wellington, Hardinge and Lawrence, and with the European policy of Canning, which, instead of conspiring with the Turk and with reactionary Austria for the repression of struggling nationalities, held out to them the hand of generous aid, and made grateful friends of the powers of the future: in the meantime, let Jingoism drink the cup that it has mixed and work out its own signal condemnation"—such, perhaps, would be the counsel that would be whispered by the interest of party, combined with patience and foresight. From a higher point of view, any result, short of a complete defeat of the Liberals, may be regarded with perfect tranquillity. The tide may turn now or it may turn ten years hence; but in the end it will turn. Jingoism, like other outbreaks of pride and violence, which, in nations as in men, are often caused by fulness of bread, will in time subside and give place to respect for human right, supported by the commercial interest of a nation which subsists by peaceful traffic and is assailable on every sea. It is the offspring of the tavern, of which it reeks; and the offspring of the tavern is never strong: in truth, any approach of war to their own shores would at once produce a change in the minds of Common Councilmen who, now lying beside their nectar, exult in launching the bolt on distant lands. Still less need it be feared that anything which may for a time befall the Liberal party in England will reverse, or in any material degree arrest, the grand transition of humanity from the primeval herd with its leading animal, to the commonwealth based on reason and equal right, from the rule of force to that "best form of government" which, in the words of a famous English Liberal, "doth actuate and dispose all parts and members of the State to the common good." Aristocratic or plutocratic reaction, the passing chill of political scepticism, despondency bred of over-reachings and errors on the part of the champions of progress, one or all of

these, aided perhaps by the ignorant passions of the less civilized masses and the craft of some cunning intriguer, may arrest the onward movement to-day; to-morrow it begins again. In truth, anyone who measures the progress of Europe, especially in regard to those fundamental beliefs which ultimately govern whatever is less fundamental, during the last quarter of a century, will find ground for alarm rather in the rapidity than in the slowness of the Revolution. It may safely be said that within the memory of men scarcely yet old, the death knell has been rung, not only of Dynastic Legitimacy, but of State Religion; and there have been deeper changes than even these.

The battle will be fought in the main between the two regular parties—the Tories, as they now again call themselves, and the Liberals,—but the special issue presented by Jingoism will cause some deflection from the ordinary party lines. As a rule, the Tory is friendly to the military system and to a policy of aggrandizement, his instinct telling him that both are antidotes to political progress, and that Imperialism, instead of being the consort of liberty, is sure in the case of England as in that of Rome to be her destroyer. For the same political reasons, as well as on economical grounds, the Liberal as a rule is in favour of peaceful industry, international amity, and unambitious self-defence. But there are Tories who are not Jingoes, because they have a strong suspicion that violence of of every kind tends ultimately to revolution, and there are Liberals who are Jingoes, because their Liberalism is violence. Perhaps we should rather call the first class Conservatives, and the second Radicals; for both in the Conservative and in the Liberal character there is an element of moderation which the names Tory and Radical seem to exclude. Of the Conservative Anti-Jingoes the most distinguished example is Lord Derby; of the Radical Jingoes the most distinguished example, since the death of Mr. Roebuck, who was a furious partisan of the Slave Power as well as of Turkey, and a plain-spoken advocate of the practice of butchering Aborigines as wild beasts, is Mr. Cowen, whose speeches the Tories have been circulating

by hundreds of thousands as their best electioneering ammunition. Lord Derby, having personally broken with the Ministry, has taken his seat on the cross benches and openly thrown his Lancashire influence on the Liberal, or to speak with strict accuracy, on the Whig side. But those who among the Ministerialists in either House share Lord Derby's sentiments, and they are not few or inconsiderable, remain within the lines, where they hope to exert an influence over the councils of the party. The Radical Jingoes, on the contrary, fling party allegiance to the winds and assail without remorse those whose general principles and aims they profess to share. What the influence of Imperialism and aggression abroad is likely to be on home politics, they do not stop to think, and probably if they did stop to think they would not care. They had a close parallel in the French Chauvinists, also styling themselves Liberals, who were always assailing the Government of Louis Philippe because he persisted in keeping the peace, and one of whom said in a manifesto, "I want to see the liberties of France radiate abroad: we have forgotten that this is the land of Louis XIV. and Napoleon." They have persuaded themselves that Russia is the Devil of Europe, and that they are themselves the Other Power. The following of Mr. Cowen and his compeers is large. With them is the mass of the populace in the cities, ignorant, irresponsible, scarcely conscious of taxation, revelling in the roar of the British Lion, full of bluster, greedy of excitement, loving war—that is at a distance—and "a long butcher's bill" for much the same reasons for which it loves dog-fights, cockfights, and the spectacle of dangerous tight-rope dancing, or of a woman shot out of a cannon. With them are the taverns, gin-palaces, and music halls, especially in the metropolis, with all their crew. If you meet a rowdy staggering away from one of these places, you may be sure that whether in his home sentiments he is "Blue" or "Yellow," he is for a spirited foreign policy, for making Zulus and Afghans feel his imperial power, and for asserting, through the mouth of the cannon, his ascendency in the Councils of Europe. The

lower Metropolitan constituencies are very largely—not Conservative—but Jingo.

The general character of each of the two regular parties is well known. The line which divides them and renders a struggle between them inevitable, is real and distinct. Toryism, broadly speaking, is the party of aristocracy, while wealth, for the most part, is drawn to the same side by social affinity, as well as by the common instinct of resistance to change. Liberalism in its ultimate tendency is democratic. But there is a distinction between the two which is not commonly observed, though it is one which, in all struggles, unless the nation at large is aroused and united in favour of some great reform, gives an enormous advantage to the Tories. The Tory party is distinctively a party of interest; the Liberal party is distinctively a party of opinion. Interest is single and unites; opinion, especially on the side of progress, is various and divides. Hence the compactness of the Tory party, its perfect obedience to discipline, and the extreme rarity of any show of individual independence much more of mutiny, in its camp; while, on the other side, the ranks, both in the House and in the country, are with the greatest difficulty held together, and one Liberal government after another is overthrown by the rebellion now of the "Adullamites" of the right, now of the "Tea-roomers" of the left wing. In 1858, Lord Palmerston, then Prime Minister, having brought in a Bill against conspiracies to murder foreign Sovereigns, the Tories voted in accordance with their principles for the introduction of the Bill, which was carried, after a fierce debate, by 318 to 173; but the division having disclosed the fact that there was a split in the Ministerial ranks, of which advantage might be taken to throw out the government, they, at the word of command, wheeled and voted against the second reading, which was lost by 234 to 215. They had done much the same in the division on the Irish Coercion Bill which overthrew Peel. Every Tory who, at his leader's bidding, voted for household suffrage in 1867, as a stroke of party strategy, had placed upon record in speeches and election

addresses his belief that a large extension of the suffrage would be dangerous to the Constitution, and had vociferously cheered Mr. Lowe's eloquent denunciations of the more moderate reform proposed by Lord Russell and Mr. Gladstone the year before. Mr. Lowe repeated his appeals with increased force against a far more democratic measure; but instead of applause from the Tory benches, he was met with enforced and moody silence. It was notorious that, with regard to the Bill creating the title of Empress of India, there were many suppressions of real opinion. The Tory party in London, and, indeed, throughout the country, consisting virtually of a limited number of people of rank and wealth, is a close social confederacy, which would visit with serious penalties any one of its members who should vote against a Tory government, and if his vote turned it out, would mark him for the rest of his life. But Professor Fawcett could with perfect impunity combine with the Tory opposition to overthrow Mr. Gladstone's government on the Irish University Bill, though it was generally believed that he did this for a selfish end. Mr. Lowe and Mr. Goschen voted against their party on the County Franchise Bill, yet they keep their places as leaders. It is the same in the elections as in the House. Scarcely such a thing is ever heard of as a split on the Tory side: the nomination is settled by the local magnates, probably in the dining-room of one of them; the rank and file bow to the irresistible mandate and move in docile unity to the poll. An independent Conservative candidate, if such a portent should appear, would occupy in county society about as pleasant a position as a man who had shot a fox. In the club, or at the hunting-meet, he would hardly dare again to show his face. But on the Liberal side double, and even triple, nominations are common: splits are the order of the day; elections are thrown into the hands of the enemy by Working-Men's candidatures, which the Tories have now learned to foster as the means of ruining their opponents. The adoption by the Liberals of a system of nominating conventions has been censured as an imitation of the party tyranny of the United States.

It is open to objection, no doubt, as trenching on that freedom of individual thought and action which is a fundamental article of the Liberal creed: yet it is a measure of absolutely necessary self-defence, without which the Liberals would have no chance of polling their real vote, or of holding their ground at all against the serried phalanx of their opponents. No machinery of coercion which party tyranny ever devised can exceed in intensity of pressure the social sentiment of a Tory county or of a Tory drawing-room.

The great Conservative interest and the solid nucleus of the party is, of course, the territorial aristocracy, embracing not only the peers and baronets, but the landlords generally, whose tenure of their estates is aristocratic, and who are socially identified with the higher ranks of their order, into which every one of them hopes in his own person or in that of one of his descendants, some day, to rise. With this aristocracy is now closely united a vast mass of commercial wealth. Before the Repeal of the Corn Laws, the landlord, whose interest made him a Protectionist, and the manufacturer, whose interest made him a Free Trader, were separated from each other by a deadly feud, and the manufacturer in those days was almost invariably a Liberal; but that question having been settled, and the manufacturer having obtained his cheap bread and the labour which he needed, wealth yielded to its natural bias. At the same time the social exclusiveness of aristocracy began to give way to political necessity, and the millionaire without a pedigree was admitted to the edge, at least, of the charmed circle towards which he pressed with the eagerness of the true Briton, whose character is a singular mixture of civic sturdiness with social servility. This junction of plutocracy with the aristocracy is the critical event of recent English politics: its fruit was the Conservative victory of 1874. Aristocracy and plutocracy between them bring into the field an immense clientage. In England the landlords have hitherto commanded absolutely the votes of the farmers, who have been tenants at will, and generally at an easy rent; the difference being taken out in social and political alle-

giance. In one or two constituencies there have been slight insurrections and tenant farmer candidates have been brought forward; but these candidates, when elected, have turned out mere Tory rank and file. A great change may take place in the political as well as in the social character of the county if the Land question follows the course on which it seems to be entering and the farmer strikes for a lease; but as yet his fidelity to his landlord seems unshaken, and if it is, the Tories will make a clean sweep of all the English counties in which there is not a large commercial element, saving the few in which the Liberals have a seat reserved to them by the operation of the Minority clause. Of the clergy of the Establishment, under the strange system of family livings, many are actually nominees and often relatives of the landlords; and the privileged Church, as a whole, has always cast in her lot with other privileged orders, and faithfully followed the fortunes of the Tory party. A certain number of High Churchmen have gone against the Mahomedan policy of the Government and in favour of the Eastern Christians, with whom they have a special sympathy; but the High Churchmen, at least the more thoroughgoing of them, are now on the brink of secession from the Establishment itself: their political independence, therefore, is an exception which proves the rule. The bulk of the rectors will see with the same eyes as the Bishop who declared that he distinctly discerned a spiritual object in the Afghan war. They will lend, as nature bids, their strenuous aid to the party which is the bulwark of their institution; and though the cry of "Church in Danger" is no longer what it was in the days of Sacheverell, the influence of the clergy is still great. In the rural districts the parson is not only the preacher but the squire's prime minister, and, in the squire's frequent absence, the vice-squire. In the cities he has his following. It would be much larger, and he would cast a much heavier vote if the Social Radicals in the House of Commons could have their suicidal way and give the Suffrage to the Women; as was clearly enough seen by Lord Beaconsfield, who always helped

the Female Suffragists to apply the knife to their own throats and that of their party, by giving not only his vote, but all the personal support in his power, to the Bill.

Another ally the Tory party has, not robed in the surplice of a Christian minister, yet to the full as powerful as the ally who is. We make a great fuss about our groggeries in this country, but we do not know what a strong Liquor Interest means. In England, a sum nearly equal to the national revenue, according to Lord Chancellor Cairns, is now spent in drink, and the number of persons engaged in the sale is about one for every thirty-five houses. The trade is a league with its grasp on every city, village, and hamlet in England; for two or three cottages can hardly rise together, before the emissary of the Liquor Interest is there, in a house which he often occupies rent free on condition of his selling, by any means and allurements in his power, a certain quantity of beer. The capital embarked in this business is enormous; the partners, active or sleeping, are innumerable. The present House of Commons has been nicknamed the "Bung" Parliament: there are in it twenty-three brewers and distillers, while the number of members in some way connected with the Liquor Interest has been reckoned as over fifty. In the cities the number of people connected with the taverns and gin shops, or in some way under their influence, is immense: we have heard an experienced ward-politician estimate it, in one case, as a fifth of the whole constituency. Besides this, the taverns alone can bribe with perfect safety and impunity. They have only to broach the cask for a week before the election and let the poor and thirsty elector have the beer nominally on credit, but really free. No one who has been at a contested election in an English city, where a brewer was a candidate, can have failed to observe the effects. The trade is represented by a powerful morning journal entirely devoted to its service, and its action in politics displays the unity and vigour which association in questionable lucre never fails to inspire. Its resentment at a limitation of the drinking hours, in which the more respectable publicans acquiesced, but which

offended the trade in general, was among the main causes of the overthrow of the Liberal government in 1874. Against such a Hydra the struggle is one not only for release from moral thraldom, but for political life; and reformers in England may have the warrant of supreme necessity for measures which here would be an unwarrantable interference with private liberty. For reasons which it might perhaps be a delicate undertaking to analyse, the Liquor Interest adheres steadfastly and enthusiastically to the Tory party. It pays the Established Church the same compliment, and the election placard coupling "our national beverage" with our "national religion" was no fable. Sir Stafford Northcote appeals to the susceptibilities of the Publican and the response will not be doubtful.

This influence has been largely increased by the Tory Reform Bill of 1867, extending the city franchise to the lowest class of householders, whose qualifications for holding political power may be readily divined by any one who has the fortitude to make a tour of inspection through the back streets and slums of an English city. It has been proved in election trials that voters of that class literally did not know the names of the parties or of their leaders. There need be no hesitation in saying that the ignorance of these masses, their levity of character, their openness to the arts of wirepullers and their amenability to the influences of claptrap, treating, and beer, were the real motives for giving them the suffrage. The agricultural labourer, a more respectable man, and certainly not less in need of any protection that the possession of a vote may afford, was left unenfranchised, though from his relation to the landowner, he might specially claim the care of the Tories, and was, in fact, the object of their almost tearful solicitude when they were struggling against the admission of foreign grain. The same party, it will be remembered, which carried Household Suffrage, had just thrown out, with the aid of the Adullamites, a moderate extension of the franchise, which would have brought within the pale of the constitution a body of tradesmen, and of the more educated artisans. This

is Tory democracy. The Conservatism of Sir Robert Peel aimed at basing government on intelligence and responsibility, and it looked for support specially to the middle classes, ranging from the merchant, the yeoman, or the professional man, to the educated and thriving artisan, in which those qualities are peculiarly found. But Tory Democracy aims at allying the extremes of society against the middle classes. It is locally the invention of Lord Beaconsfield, or rather he borrowed it from the Jacobites, who, under the leadership of Sir William Windham, wanted to introduce universal suffrage, because they saw in it a hope of raising a political mob which would overturn the Whig government and the Hanoverian throne. But in fact the tendency of despotism and oligarchy to call the populace to their aid in extremity is not confined to one nation; it has been exhibited on many political stages: by the Bourbons in their alliance with the lazzaroni at Naples, by the Southern slaveowners in their alliance with the Irish mob of the Northern cities. This stroke of an unscrupulous policy has not failed of its effect. The day may come when the "Residuum," as it is styled by political courtesy, veiling "dregs" in the decent obscurity of a learned language, will begin to think, or at least to covet, for itself; when it will find leaders of its own who will hold out to it bribes more substantial than a word of flattery from a nobleman on the stump, a Jingo song, and a pot of beer; but at present it is, in the main, the docile client of the Tory aristocracy, and has been the means of turning many city elections in its favour. It is arrayed under strict discipline in Conservative Working Men's Associations, which are alleged not seldom to serve the purpose of treating as well as of organization. It of course accepts the party nomination blindly, and marches in close column to the poll.

Other special auxiliaries of the Tories might be named. The wishes of the Court, while they will not be openly exhibited, will be felt to be on Lord Beaconsfield's side; and to extend Court influence, though not in the interest of the Court

itself but of the aristocracy, is an aim of Tory policy, which in this instance also, has been successful. We mean with regard to the masses: no policy was needed to induce upstart wealth, of the more vulgar kind, to throng Court Drawing-rooms and Levees. The military interest also is strong: in the House of Commons two hundred and sixty members are connected with it, as actual or retired officers of the regular army, militia, yeomanry, or volunteers; while through the country it is represented by a multitude of half-pay or retired officers, many of whom are unemployed and can make themselves very active in elections. On the last occasion, incensed at the Army Reforms, it did its worst against the Liberals, and was thought to have had no small share in their overthrow. Apart from any special grievance, it is the natural adherent of the Tory policy which promises military expenditure and opens a dazzling prospect to military ambition. The military adventurer, of the Baker Pacha and Hobart Pacha type, is a character which has of late appeared in England with increased definiteness, and is not unlikely to grow in importance. The war trades, such as manufactures of small arms and iron-plating, are also powerful; and of course they vote for war.

If the political distribution of the wealth of England could be ascertained it is probable that a full moiety might be found to be on the Liberal side; but of the great fortunes, and therefore of the wealth available for election purposes, an overwhelming proportion is on the side of the Tories. Of direct bribery at election times there is now said to be not much: it has been nearly killed by the strictness and the Rhadamantine administration of the new law. But the influences of wealth have only changed their channel. Constituencies are "nursed," that is bribed all the year round with gifts, subscriptions, and entertainments. We could point to a constituency which was literally rented by a millionaire who distributed every Christmas, through a political friend, a large sum in gifts to the poorer voters, asking no questions about their votes, but letting it be understood that the stream of bounty would continue to flow

so long as he remained their member. In so money-loving a country, indeed, a rich candidate fascinates in himself, irrespectively of any actual largess: it is always believed that, in some way or other, he will descend to the embraces of the constituency in a shower of gold. Wealth is also of unspeakable service to the Tories in providing them with a perfect organization. Thanks to its aid, they possess an army of political agents distributed through the country, always engaged in canvassing, drilling, bedevilling local sentiment, and reporting to headquarters its state from day to day. This is the special department of public business to which Lord Beaconsfield's industry has been applied. The larger and the looser is the Constituency, the more necessary, and the more expensive, organization becomes: in this way also the great extension of the Suffrage in 1867 has helped the Tory game. An attempt to create a counter machinery, of a voluntary kind, has been made by Mr. Chamberlain, the great organizing genius on the Liberal side; but he has not the long purse at his command; and on this most vital point the Tories have an enormous advantage.

Of the Liberal party, the strongest and most indomitable fortress is Scotland, in which Mr. Gladstone, whom his enemies imagined to be discredited and depressed, met the other day with a reception which loosened the knees of Toryism with fear. The reasons of this fact are clear. In Scotland, the people are universally educated and trained to self-government in Church as well as in State, while the farmers instead of being tenants at will, and political vassals of the landlords, have leases, and generally long leases, of their land. That the Liberals will gain in Scotland seems to be expected on all hands. In England, they have always been in a minority; but their ranks are there formed of the elements akin to those which man their lines in Scotland, comprising a large proportion of the middle classes and the more skilled and better educated artisans. A few Whig landowners, retained by old connection rather than by conviction, at present form the head of the spear; but the tie which fastens the head to the shaft has now become so loose

and attenuated that it is doubtful whether it will hold through another battle; through a battle fought on the issue of the Land Law it certainly will not. Several Whigs have already made the Foreign Policy question a bridge for a virtual secession without an avowed apostacy. In 1874, almost the whole of the clique openly or covertly betrayed Mr. Gladstone, and the *Edinburgh*, their regular organ, exulted without disguise over his fall. Now, on the eve of a decisive contest, that journal assumes towards the Liberals an air of insolent exclusiveness, stigmatises the conduct of their leaders, including Mr. Chamberlain, as though it had nothing to do with them, and in the most offensive manner gives them to understand that they are to have nothing to say to the policy of the party on the Land question. Beyond doubt the writer would rejoice in a Liberal defeat. Lord Granville, Lord Hartington, and the Duke of Argyll behave to their companions-in-arms like men of honour, but they cannot make an aristocratic clique love a democratic party. Yet the rank of the Whigs is of use in a country so imbued with respect for those distinctions, and there is a reluctance to part with them, though some day the parting must come.

The Old Guard, in England, alike of domestic liberty and of international morality, are the Free Churches, dubbed by the Privileged Church "Dissenters." That he has ruined the power of the Dissenters by ruining that of the Middle Class, is the special boast of Lord Beaconsfield, to whom Middle Class and Dissenters have always been equally odious. That his Reform Bill let in a flood of political elements, decidedly not Methodist, has already been admitted. But the main explanation of the fact—for a fact we believe it to be—that the strength of the Free Churches has declined, is to be sought probably in a different direction. Being without State aid or legal privilege, they subsist entirely by conviction, and therefore, on them the decay of conviction has told most heavily. The State Church, indeed, paradoxical as the statement may seem, has rather gained by the decline of religious faith. Scepticism,

socially conformist, finds in it an easy pew, and many sceptics being political Conservatives, support it all the more strenuously as a bulwark of Conservatism. Some even avowedly uphold it as a safeguard against religious enthusiasm. Moreover, whether it be the Church of the Apostles, or not, it is unquestionably the Church of the genteel. Wealth desirous of gentility comes over to it, and it is said that, even in Scotland, Presbyterians are often turned into Episcopalians by their success in trade. Disestablishment in England appears not to gain ground: it will come; but it will probably be brought about by disruption from within, rather than by the battering ram of the Free Churches from without. Since the removal of their disabilities, not a few of the wealthier Nonconformists, especially of the Wesleyans, have been becoming Conservative. But as Christians and philanthropists they are all opposed to Jingoism, and will, no doubt, cast a solid vote against it at the coming election.

Of the intellectual and literary force of the country, a large proportion is with the Liberals. Considering how lavishly the Tories have subsidized the press, it is creditable to journalism, as a calling, that the best writing on the whole should have been always found upon the other side.

In the days of O'Connell, Ireland used to furnish a large contingent to the Liberal forces; yet even then the connection was compromising, and brought weakness as well as strength. In these days of Home Rule, it is not only compromising but dangerous in the highest degree. Lord Beaconsfield sees this, and in his letter to the Lord-Lieutenant tries to fix upon the Liberal leaders the odium of encouraging disaffection in Ireland. The answer is conclusive: Ireland would be now one mass of disaffection had it not been for Catholic Emancipation, Disestablishment, and the Reform of the Land Law, of which the last two were carried by Mr. Gladstone, while the first, though carried by the Duke of Wellington and Peel, was a Liberal measure which they had been compelled to adopt, after protracting their resistance till the choice lay between concession

and civil war. These measures have brought the upper classes, who are usually the leaders of the people, almost universally to the side of the Union, and have thus averted the danger in which, had the maxims of Lord Beaconsfield's party prevailed, the Empire would long ago have been involved. Apart from any object of electioneering tactics, justice and conciliation towards Ireland are the natural policy of Liberals, while coercion is the natural policy of the Tories. The Irish, who are now strong, not only in Ireland but in many of the English cities, especially in the North, have extorted Home Rule concessions from candidates of both parties. Lord Castlereagh, after winning a seat in Ireland by an alliance with the Home Rulers, received the public congratulations of Lord Beaconsfield; and a Home Rule leader, stung by seeing his party treated as unclean beasts, contact with whom is pollution, has been disclosing the flirtations of other Conservatives with the agitation. In the House of Commons the Home Rulers have not supported the Liberals any more than they have supported the Tories, to whom, on the Catholic University question, or any other question, their votes have been always welcome. But Lord Beaconsfield has learned from the success of the slanderous attacks on Sir Robert Peel by which he made his political fortune, that the effectiveness of an accusation depends, not upon its truth, but upon the intensity of the passions to which it is addressed. The English people, though not so infuriated against the Home Rulers as the Landlords were against the repealer of the Corn Law, are easily excited on that subject. For the Irish land question they care nothing; they regard it as a nuisance: they do not want to protect the rents of the absentees: they would willingly consent, if they were asked, to legislation enacting that all the potatoes should grow with their roots upmost. But upon the question of the Union they feel strongly. Mr. Gladstone has positively disclaimed any sympathy with the object of the Disunionists. But as anger is blind, his undeniable sympathy with the Irish people will probably lend credit to the calumnies of his rival, and cost him

and his party many English votes. What the Home Rulers will do it is as difficult to say as it is to divine their real object and the specific means by which they propose to attain it. Hitherto, they have seemed to delight in ruining those who, so far as their aims were reasonable and practicable, were their best friends. The Government attempted to draw the Liberals into apparent complicity with Obstruction, by bringing forward the new rules of debate without that previous communication with the leaders of the Opposition which usage and courtesy required; but the trap was clumsily baited and the device failed.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy, and the votes under their immediate influence, both in Ireland and in England, have been secured to the Tories by the Irish University Act. Apart from this, however, the priests, their own religious grievance having been removed by Disestablishment, and the only object for which they allied themselves with Liberalism having thus been accomplished, are drawn by the bias of the priestly nature to the party which is a limb of the European Reaction. This tendency has been very visible of late. At Southwark the Catholic organization was brought thoroughly into play in favour of the Tory candidate. If the Liberals are wise, they will without more coquetting or paltering, frankly take up the gauntlet. By doing so they will at once gain strength in the Presbyterian North of Ireland, which is by nature theirs, though the cross-accidents of Irish history have thrown it into the arms of their enemies.

Prediction we leave to those who can read the stars. Some good judges are of opinion that the result will be a Liberal gain, but not large enough to turn out the Government. If we were to say that we think this, our wish might appear father to our thought. Nobody can discern the real set of national sentiment at a distance from the scene, let him read as many English journals as he will; he will not learn it from the *Times*, which is now a thorough-going Ministerial organ. Besides the great issues, minor influences, local, sectional, and personal, eccentricities, crotchets,

cupidities, jealousies without end, will assert themselves everywhere and play freely under the screen of the Ballot. As was said before, there are some thirty boroughs in which, at the last election, the majorities were so small that a feather's weight may turn the scale. For our own part, we have faith in the solid and compact strength of a great aristocratic and land-owning interest, which has a large portion of the constituencies securely in its grasp; in the influence of the State clergy; in the power of drink and of the Licensed Victuallers; in the ascendancy of wealth among a money-loving people; in the efficacy of a well-paid, complete, and all-penetrating organization; in the force of excited passion, as well as of grosser allurements, among masses of ignorance and intemperance; in the ease with which ordinary men, though neither ignorant nor intemperate, are led by appeals to patriotism, whether true or false, and to the love of glory, whether moral or immoral. Be the result what it may, it need shake nobody's confidence in the ultimate triumph of reason and humanity; it need cause nobody to doubt that it is righteousness alone that exalts a nation.

A further reason why even those who desire the ultimate success of the Liberal cause should not be anxious for its immediate victory is that it must soon be left without a great leader. Mr. Gladstone has kept his seventieth birthday. Nature has cast him, physically as well as mentally, in the strongest mould: his powers of labour have been, and still are, almost superhuman; of nervous energy he has almost too much, since his character lacks that element of repose which is seldom wanting to greatness; and he knows not how to resign himself to a masterly inactivity, when for the moment action is inexpedient. But he is mortal and must soon betray his mortality. There is no one at present to take his place. Lord Granville, the official head of the party, is a thoroughly able, cool-headed, and sagacious man of the world, whose winning manners and consummate tact have been displayed for many years in carrying the legislation of a Liberal government through an adverse House of Lords. It did him no harm to be the Master of the

Buck-hounds before he became a statesman.' But he is a great noble, and to see him before a popular assembly is to be convinced that there is little in common between him and the people. Lord Hartington, the leader of the party in the House of Commons, was a last resort: in truth his elevation was partly the work of intriguers, who thought that he would be a puppet and that they should pull his wires. He has in every respect greatly bettered expectation, and is assuredly no puppet. As a speaker he has improved; his character has risen under responsibility; his manly frankness and straightforwardness have won general confidence; his temper, sorely tried, has always stood the test; and he has succeeded beyond hope in holding together the discordant sections of the party. But he also lacks the popular fibre of Mr. Gladstone. He can hardly inspire the enthusiasm which he does not feel. He is a hereditary, and, though he does the duties of his post, almost an amateur, politician: and there is probably a good deal of truth as well as point in the common saying that he gives the week to the turf, and reads up his Blue Books on Sunday. His nonchalance is not merely manner: the story of his yawning in the middle of his own speech would not have been told of another man. Mr. Lowe has brilliant gifts and immense mental wealth; but though a thoroughgoing Liberal in philosophy, he is an intellectual aristocrat, mistrustful, almost scornful, of the people; besides he is nearly as old as Mr. Gladstone, and he seems to be content with the conversational empire which he enjoys. Lord Cardwell, the great administrator of the party, and the only survivor except Mr. Gladstone of the staff of Sir Robert Peel, is but three years Mr. Gladstone's junior; and he has always shrunk from leadership more than leadership has shrunk from him. Mr. W. E. Forster, a vigorous man of business, and a strong though uncouth speaker, has, by his tortuous ways, lost the confidence of a large portion of the party: he now sits for Bradford by Tory votes; "the best stage Yorkshireman on any boards" he has been called in reference to his outward bluntness and inward freedom from that infirmity;

and it might be added that he is the best servant out of livery whom the Tory aristocracy possesses. Mr. Goschen surprised the world by his display of administrative ability as First Lord of the Admiralty, but he has no other hold on the House or country, and he shares the anti-democratic tendencies of Mr. Lowe. Sir William Harcourt, is a most powerful and effective speaker in the forensic style, though better on the platform than in the House; but his speeches lack the stamp not only of statesmanship but of conviction: an ex-member of Mr. Gladstone's government, he committed the great mistake of striking his chief when he was down, and paying open court to the leader of the enemy; and thus created a decided impression that the choice of parties was with him only a choice of markets. Among the new aspirants, the star of Sir Charles Dilke seems to be in the ascendant; but there is in the whole group an apparent lack both of definite purpose and of unity, as well as a good deal of the jealousy which usually prevails among subordinate ambitions in the absence of a commanding power. A party of interest may get on with a bell-wether; a party of opinion needs a chief. What the Liberals now want is a Gladstone of thirty-five, less the ecclesiastical element, to begin where the Gladstone of seventy is leaving off. Yet it must be owned that it is difficult to see where the man is to be found, or how, if found, he could make his way into the House of Commons: he could hardly do so unless, with popular sympathies and the requisite breadth of view, he united wealth and station which commonly bind a man to a class. The Liberal representation has suffered, even more than the Tory, from the absorbing claims of local ambition. In former days, the rich trader or manufacturer was content to show his influence in the election without aspiring to a seat himself, and openings were thus made for the rising hopes of the party. Now the rich trader or manufacturer aspires to the seat himself, or, if he does not, his wife does. The Liberal benches in the House are filled with rows of men who have been brought into Parliament late in life without political training, and who can hardly

make good members of Parliament, much less leaders. The last Speaker was heard to say that he did not know, when the old men were gone, who was to govern the country. Reformers begin to regret the Rotten Boroughs.

To the absence of a leader in Parliament, really equal to his position, must in the main be attributed the fatally weak and and wavering attitude of the party on the Eastern Question. An immense quantity of blank cartridge has been fired in declamatory demonstration, but in action the party has confined itself to thwarting the Government, thereby bringing upon itself the odium of an unpatriotic factiousness, and of seeking to weaken the influence of England in the Councils of Europe. Had it been better led it would have frankly confronted the policy of Lord Beaconsfield with the policy of Canning. It would have made the nation feel that intervention on the side of generosity and justice was a different thing from isolation, that the greatness of England would not be betrayed nor her place in the councils of Europe forfeited by exhibiting her as the chivalrous friend, not the jealous enemy, of the struggling nationalities; that Russia instead of being abetted in her schemes of ambition would be deprived of her greatest advantage when she was prevented from appearing as the sole deliverer and patroness of the oppressed. Fanatical friends of Islam, such as Mr. Cowen, might have done as they thought fit; their votes would not have been many, and their rhetoric would have lost its sting when they could no longer appeal to the pride of the nation against a policy of inaction and self-effacement.

In one respect, at all events, the Government was well-advised in not delaying the Dissolution. The Ottoman Empire, upon the life of which their whole policy is based, is now actually in its death throes, and England is likely soon to have upon her hands a vast anarchy, the remote frontier of which, to aggravate the difficulty of her task, she has bound herself to maintain against a great military power, her own army being barely sufficient to furnish troops for a Zulu war. The time can

hardly be far distant when the very Jingoes will be sorry that she did not take a loyal and straightforward course at the Conference of Constantinople; that she did not press effectively upon Turkey the reforms in Bulgaria, in favour of which all the Powers had pronounced, and thus save the Ottoman Empire from a war that was certain to be its death-blow. There would then have been no Sepoy demonstrations, no Berlin Councils, no diplomatic thunder or parade of British power; none of the excitement afforded to the lovers of martial spectacles by the most butcherly of modern wars; but the Eastern question would have been settled for the time, and put in the way of gradual and pacific solution hereafter, by consigning the Ottoman power to slow decay instead of headlong ruin. Truly, the English Liberals may afford to wait awhile.

—If a speech of the Dean of Westminster is correctly reported, it is "irrevocably settled" by an overruling power that there shall be a monument to the late Prince Imperial in Westminster Abbey. Evidently the poor Dean is in a most unpleasant position, and he shows his sense of it, in answering remonstrances, by a tartness which is utterly foreign to his general character. He cannot really imagine that the Prince "died for England." The Prince met his death in an attempt to win a military reputation for himself, with a view to the furtherance of his own designs as a Pretender to the French throne. The plan had been conceived and adopted with that object in the unscrupulous councils of the leaders of his party. So far from his being in the service of England, he had applied for admission to it, and his application had been refused; he was on the field as a mere spectator, and in this, as in more essential respects, his case differed from that of the French Princes who were attached to the staff of General McClellan, even admitting the Dean to be right in supposing that, had one of the French Princes fallen, the Americans would have heaped unbounded honours on his grave. There was nothing heroic in the circum-

stances of this Prince's death; he fell into an ambuscade and was killed in endeavouring to escape. Pity is always awakened by the loss of a young life; but, in this case, it is pity qualified by the recollection that the youth was taking part, for a purely selfish purpose, in the butchery of an unfortunate race, who had done him no sort of wrong. His moral position was worse than that of a mercenary soldier. The erection of a monument to him at Westminster is inevitably construed as a demonstration of sympathy with Bonapartism and Imperialism on the part of the English Court, and, if the Heir Apparent continues politically in the frame of mind in which he at present appears to be, it may prove the commencement of a more serious divergence of sentiment between the Court and the people.

It happens that, at this moment, a work which throws a vivid light on the character of the founder of the Bonaparte dynasty and of modern Imperialism is in all hands. The general trustworthiness of the 'Memoirs of Madame de Rémusat' cannot be doubted. Her acuteness and correctness as an analyst of character are abundantly proved by the portraits of Talleyrand, Maret, Duroc, Savary, Murat, and others, in which her minute delineations are confirmed by history. She had the best opportunities of observing Bonaparte as a man, and of seeing clearly what lay beneath his uniform and his purple. Every one, we think, must feel that her impressions of him in the earlier portion of his career are fresh and genuine, not fabricated by hostile retrospect after the estrangement, the ultimate occurrence of which she never attempts to keep out of sight. Her censure is not indiscriminate; she lets us distinctly see, not only the extraordinary mental power of Napoleon, but the better parts of his character, or rather the promise of something good which attached her to him and made her hopeful about him till a complete victory was given to the evil part of his nature by the possession of unbounded power. In the house of the late Jerome Bonaparte, at Baltimore, stood a bust of his uncle taken at the time of the expedition to Egypt, and retaining a linger-

ing gleam of something like sentiment and enthusiasm, which was utterly lost when the countenance had become fixed in the hard lines of an absolutely selfish ambition. That gleam appears in the pages of Madame de Remusat. Scarcely ever does she use the language of hatred, or even of indignation. What a Moloch, and what a sharper, France and Europe worshipped is rather discerned through her than proclaimed by her. The vices which she depicts in the Bonaparte of the inner circle are the very same by which, on the greater scene, he brought ruin on himself and his institutions after turning Europe into an Aceldama and France into a house of weeping. His domestic impurity and that of his family and set are matters of history, as certain as they are revolting, and were only a a signal intance of the general destruction, by the Revolution and the dissolving forces which had prepared the way for it, of the old morality, in place of which no new code had been formed. His astounding lack of the sense of honour, his habit of unabashed lying, and his spirit of low intrigue, were, in like manner, shared by the swarm of vile adventurers which arose from the wreck of revolutionary effort, though in this also he overtopped them all Madame de Remusat says that he avowed to Talleyrand that nothing would deter him from any act of baseness which it might be expedient to commit: she represents his sycophant, Maret, speculating on his trick of opening other people's letters as the means of bringing fabricated proofs of devotion under his eye. What is there in this more startlingly vile than we find in his policy and in his diplomacy, in his treacherous sale of Venetian independence, or his more than burglarious seizure of the crown of Spain? What picture of mendacity can go beyond the bulletins, or the despatch to the Senate, which, with portentous circumstantiality of lying, describes Waterloo as a victory? That the first general, and perhaps the greatest master of state-craft in his time, was inwardly what Madame de Remusat paints him, may be a fact difficult of digestion to the worshippers of intellectual force, but it is only the most striking of many such facts which they have to accept. In callous sel-

fishness and utter indifference to human suffering, Bonaparte stands first among civilized, if not among all, men. He met, as Metternich tells us, with an outburst of contempt expressed in language too brutal to be repeated, the suggestion that he might listen to overtures of peace for the sake of the lives of his people. In his flight from Waterloo, one of his officers, who told the story to Lord Brougham, seeing him deeply dejected, and thinking that he might be grieving for the slaughter of so many of his companions-in-arms, tried to comfort him by saying that Lord Wellington must have lost almost as many. "Ah!" replied the Emperor, with a coarse oath, "but he has not lost the battle." The officer shrank horror-stricken at the revelation of the demon whom he had served. The very first bulletin issued after the retreat from Russia shows that the author of that hideous catastrophe thought of nothing but himself. The announcement that his ambition had made widows and orphans by hundreds of thousands ends with the gratifying assurance that "the Emperor was never in better health."

Bonaparte used to be compared to Cromwell. Each was the offspring of a revolution which he mastered, and for a time brought to a close; but in every other respect never was there a greater contrast between two men. Cromwell was one of a great group of political and religious reformers; that character predominated in him above all others: not till he was forty years old did he draw his sword in defence of his cause; and when the cause was saved, he at once and for ever sheathed his sword again, and devoted himself to the fulfilment of his plans of political and religious reform. Napoleon was a professional soldier and a military adventurer: he never had a cause, except that of his own aggrandizement, for which the general break-up opened the way: we have his own assurance that he cared not for the Revolution except as it levelled the obstacles in his own path: not only was he a professional soldier but a Corsican, one of a half-barbarous and half-bandit race: at the root of his character was the lust of war, and one who saw him at Elba said that when war was mentioned the

passion gleamed in his evil eye: his politics were mere statecraft working for his own aggrandizement, and if he studied the ideas or the moral forces of his age it was to use them much in the same way as he used cannon. Cromwell was personally religious; he was intensely conscious of a Moral Power above him, of which he was the servant; and this feeling, ever present, was seen in his personal demeanour, and in the modesty of his Court, as well as in his freedom from cruelty and injustice. Of Napoleon, Metternich says that he was not irreligious: nor was he, in Metternich's sense of the word; he made good use of religion as an engine of state, and was supported and flattered by his priests, till he threatened their special interests, with a servility as abject as ever was a Babylonian conqueror by the priests of Belus; but of the idea of any power above him, of any kind of moral restraint upon his will and his lusts, he was, perhaps, more absolutely devoid than any other man who has ever exercised dominion over his kind: there is not a single sign of hesitation on moral grounds, of conscience or of remorse throughout the whole of his career. It has been truly said of him that the singleness of his evil mind, and his freedom from the internal strife which hampers imperfect characters, was a great part of his power. His insensate pride went the length of deploring that he could not give himself out as a god, and loved to mantle itself in a robe of tawdry pageantry, which would have been supremely ludicrous if it had not dripped blood. Of Cromwell, Algernon Sidney said that he very well understood the principles of liberty: forced, in the midst of an anarchy, to act as "constable," and to wield his truncheon for the restoration of order and peace, he never betrayed the slightest desire of arbitrary power, and he was always struggling to get back, as fast as circumstances would permit, to constitutional government and the regular ways of justice: he was too truly great to desire the false greatness of reigning over slaves. To reign over slaves devoid of any thought but that of abject obedience to his will, was the one desire of Napoleon's heart, in which it held such absolute sway that Madame de Remusat even thinks it

predominated over his love of war. His political institutions came to naught because he could not bear to leave in them the grain of freedom required to make despotism bearable, even to the French, in a civilized and thinking age. Rather than give that grain, he chose to gorge his people with perpetual repasts of "glory," in quest of which he continued his murderous raids over Europe, till trampled Humanity rose and put him down. Napoleon was a giant of intellectual power. Cromwell was one of the greatest of men. To decide which was the mightier force is impossible. Cromwell had far smaller means at his command and contended with far greater obstacles. Everything was broken up before Napoleon's advent, and he had but to fling the wrecks aside: instead of meeting in the establishment of his power with resistance so stern and resolute as that of the Republicans who opposed the Protectorate, he had but to put his foot upon the necks of creatures utterly destitute of moral force and self-respect, prone to servitude and eager to be bought. Even the victories which made his fortune as a soldier, and gave him the talisman and the ascendancy of success, were won with the enthusiastic levies of the Revolution over the hired machines of Austria led by superannuated pedants. With the first national resistance, though it was that of the undisciplined peasantry of Spain, his march of victory ended, his reverses began. Of material greatness nine-tenths are accident: the only thing which has nothing of accident in it is morality.

That which makes the character of Napoleon so transcendantly evil is that, in the whole course of history, no man has flung away such an opportunity of doing good. Had he, when fortune put supreme power into his hands, thought not of himself alone, but of his country and humanity; had he remained a true servant of liberty and progress; had he, when France was secured against aggression, closed the era of the Revolutionary wars, and turned his mind to the work of peace; had he in a generous and unselfish spirit founded institutions which would have preserved the real gains, while they discarded the

chimeras and quelled the anarchy, of the Revolution; had he spent the rest of his life in consolidating these institutions and providing that they should go down, a sure legacy of his patriotism and statesmanship to the coming generations, what fame would have been his, what blessings would have waited on his name! France would then, thanks to his beneficent genius, have led the nations in the path of ordered liberty and peaceful happiness. Instead of this, the world owes him ten years of carnage, spoliation, havoc, and a misery, the extent of which is unknown to those who have not been led to examine the details of history; a fresh series, on the most tremendous scale, of political convulsions, first in the way of reaction, then in that of recurrent revolution; and now the military system, with its fearful pressure on industry and the social paroxysms which it is too surely preparing for Europe in the near future. He fancied, in the grotesque delusion of his vanity, that he could coerce or bribe art and literature into becoming the minions of what he styled his glory. Praise *me*, sing of *me*, paint *me*, were the commands which he fancied he could issue to the historian, the poet, and the artist. He suggested himself as a subject to Goethe. Had he chosen the better part, monuments, imperial indeed, would have been his, unbidden and unbought. As it is, he has what he could command and buy—official eulogies and the column on the Place Vendome made of the cannon which were the trophies of his fields of carnage. On the foot of that column was found written, perhaps by the bereaved parent of some youthful conscript, "Monster, if all the blood which thou hast shed could be collected in this square, thou mightest drink without stooping." And it is the system formed by this man and instinct with his spirit, the restoration of which is not only the aim of a reactionary or rather predatory faction in France, but the desire of some who profess allegiance to English liberty.

One curious fact, dimly perceived before, is clearly brought out and rendered historical by Madame de Remusat. Napoleon had a fixed idea, which in his endless, and apparently aimless wars, he was trying to realize. He fancied that he could restore,

in his own person, the Empire of Charlemagne. He fancied that he could reduce the other monarchs of Europe to feudal vassalage, exercise over them the powers of a feudal suzerain, compel them, in sign of their fealty, to build themselves palaces at Paris, to keep their archives there, to attend the coronations of the French Emperor. It was under the influence of this dream that he took the title of Emperor instead of taking that of king. No doubt he thought that Karl was a Frenchman, and imagined that under him Paris was the capital of a French Empire. Of the vast and fundamental difference between the two periods produced by the progress of civilization and the growth of the European nationalties, he could have had no definite conception. He had read just history enough to become the dupe of a historic fancy for which he and his kind paid dear. He is not the only or the last instance of such an illusion. Constantinople was the most important place in the world when it was the capital of the Roman Empire, and the link between its eastern and western portions; it is not the most important place in the world now: perhaps it is not more important to England than Antwerp or Elsinore, either of which may any day fall into the hands of a great European power, while England spends her whole force in keeping her stopper in the Dardanelles. Cyprus was of great importance in the days of the Phœnicians, of the Ptolemies, of the Romans, and afterwards of the Venetians, when it lay not in a dead angle of the Mediterranean but in waters full of commerce, and when its little harbours were large enough to hold the trading vessels of the time. But the much vaunted possession brings little beyond expense and odium now. The moral is that statesmanship ought to drink deeper, or drink not at all, of the Pierian spring.

—Among the events in the history of opinion may certainly be reckoned the appearance of the concluding volume of Renan's series on the "Origin and Early History of Christianity." In France, this work is likely to shape, to a large extent, the

popular idea of Christ and His religion. Few Frenchmen have hitherto known much about the Gospels. The devout read manuals of devotion, of which the least unevangelical is Thomas a'Kempis; while sceptics have got their notions from Voltaire. Most remarkable, and of infinite importance as an indication of the place which, when criticism and science have done their utmost, Christianity, apart from supernaturalism and dogma, will hold in the minds of men, is the difference between Voltaire and Renan. Voltaire, when he cried *Ecrasez l'Infâme*, saw the religion of Jesus through the smoke of an *Auto-da-Fe*; though even he got an inkling of something nearer the truth from the brief intercourse which he held in England with the Quakers. The fires of the *Auto-da-Fe* are now quenched; the Satanic counterfeit once installed in the persecuting State Churches, which Shelley, as well as Voltaire and Rousseau, took for the Christians' God, has departed, or is departing; the divine reality presents itself to view; and Renan, the most uncompromising of critics, though he certainly is not a witness in favour of orthodoxy, is as certainly a witness, unequivocal and loud-mouthed, in favour of natural Christianity. "The hour cometh," says Jesus to the woman at the well, "when ye shall neither on this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father, but when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." "On the day," exclaims Renan, "on which Jesus spoke these words He was truly the Son of God. He uttered, for the first time, the saying on which the edifice of religion will rest for ever. He founded the true worship, without date, without country, that which the highest souls will practise to the end of time. Not only was His religion that day the religion of humanity, it was religion in the absolute sense; and if other planets have inhabitants endowed with reason and morality, their religion cannot be different from that which Jesus proclaimed by the side of Jacob's well. Man has not been able to cleave to it, because we attain the ideal only for a moment. The saying of Jesus was a gleam of light in a dark night; it has taken eighteen hundred years to

accustom the eyes of humanity (rather, I should say, of an infinitely small section of humanity) to that brightness. But the gleam will become perfect day, and, after having run the round of all errors, humanity will come back to this saying, as the immortal expression of its faith and of its hope." Listen to this ye who say that nothing spiritual, nothing ideal, nothing absolutely true, can survive the destruction of superstition by science. Listen to it ye, also, who cling desperately to the dogmatic and the supernatural in the belief that when these are gone Christianity and religion must perish. Even if we could imagine that, under the destructive touch of criticism, the woman of Samaria, the well, the very Speaker himself, should disappear, or become doubtful forms, in a mist of legend, the truth of the words spoken would remain. It would remain even if we could be constrained to believe that they were the utterance of an unknown teacher recorded by an unknown hand. Most perplexing are the widely different pictures of the Founder of Christianity and of the details of His history presented by the multiplicity of Lives which the passionate desire to see Him closer and know more of Him has brought forth: each biographer, in fact, makes a Christ after his own image; and the result is painful doubt as to the definiteness and unity of the character itself. But the sayings are separable from the incidents; and we believe that those who are most conversant with antiquity would agree with us in thinking that, while the life of a teacher was far less likely to be written by contemporary hands and with critical accuracy in those days than in these, his sayings were more likely to be remembered.

In our last number we cited Mr. Herbert Spencer and another Positivist writer as witnesses to the probable occurrence of an interval of time between the decline of the old religious morality and the advent of the scientific morality that is to be. We might have added that the other Positivist, as well as Mr. Spencer, gives us to understand that when the scientific morality comes, it will be a rationalised Christianity. Rationalise Christianity as much as you will, it is essentially and immutably

Theistic, and instead of being preëminently conducive to the prolongation and enjoyment of life, which is the Spencerian test of all morality, it led its first teacher by a direct path to an early and painful death. So that if Christianity, in any form, is to be the Ethics of the future, the end of Theism, apparently, is not yet.

— Some uneasiness has been produced, in certain quarters, by the announcement that Mr. Ingersoll is to lecture at different places in Canada. No one, we trust, will be so ill-advised and so sadly devoid of faith in the ultimate prevalence of truth as to attempt to interfere with perfect freedom of discussion. If a belief cannot hold its own against platform ridicule, the sooner it makes way for one that can, the better. Religion has survived Voltaire, the shafts of whose mockery were a good deal keener and brighter than those to which it is at present exposed. Not that we mean to express sympathy with any one who cultivates in his hearers or readers the unhappy and ignoble spirit of irreverence. To the conscientious student and inquirer, however liberal he may be, however thoroughly he may have cast off the shackles of dogma and tradition, the exhibition of that spirit is as repulsive as it can be to any priest. It is in fact the evidence of a fanaticism not less narrow in its way than that of the priest. A truly liberal and comprehensive mind would never regard the religion of Christendom as a proper object of disrespect, much less of insult.

We had ourselves the advantage of hearing Mr. Ingersoll in the States. The lecture had evidently been well studied as a platform performance and, in that point of view, was highly effective; though we could not help mentally drawing a contrast between the performer and the Christian preacher, who, on Mars' Hill, delivered the truths he bore at once with the dignity of simple earnestness, and with perfect tenderness towards the beliefs which he came to supersede. The tone would, we think, have seemed offensive to any sensible and right-minded man.

As to the reasoning, it showed either a slight opinion of the knowledge of the audience or a strange ignorance on the part of the lecturer of historical philosophy and of the recent course of thought. A few pages of Colenso, with rhetorical amplifications, would have furnished all the instruction that we got that evening. The Theology, Cosmogony and Moral Code of the Hebrews are to be judged, as every man who has followed the course of investigation knows, not positively, or by comparison with those of modern communities, living in the meridian light of Humanity and Science, but by comparison with those of other primæval races; and judged by that standard they excite not ridicule, but wonder. The perceptions of primæval man are like those of the infant; Deity and the operations of Deity can be be presented to him only in forms which to our more advanced intellects appear coarse and unworthy; the question is in every particular case, whether the ideas symbolized are higher or lower than other theologies of the same period. We still use phrases which are relics of a former mental state; we speak of "being in the hands of God;" and if anyone chose to spin this phrase out into a series of jests about the fingers, wrists, nails, &c., of the Supreme Being, his wit would be of the same type as that of Mr. Ingersoll. The Cosmogony of Moses will, of course, not bear the scrutiny of modern science; few probably are now so bigoted as to maintain that it will; but it need not fear comparison with the Cosmogony of any other race. It declares in language which, to Longinus, seemed sublime, the unity of creation, and is thus, unlike the Polytheistic ideas of the world, in harmony with the scientific conception of the universality of the physical laws. The moral code of Moses, again, is tribal and primæval: it is alien to us, who live under the ethical conditions of high civilization and the religion of Humanity; but is it worse or better than other codes framed in the same stage of human progress? We have little doubt as to the conclusion at which a candid inquirer would arrive, after studying any particular department of the Code—say that relating to marriage, to the rights of parents, to slavery,

to property, to the sanctity of human life—by the rational, that is, by the historical and comparative method. Even those internecine wars between tribes, the narrative of which now fills us with horror, belong not peculiarly to the history of the Jews, but to the primæval struggle for existence in the world before Humanity. In the lecture which we heard, Mr. Ingersoll carried his hatred of the Bible so far as to charge it with being the special source of Slavery. The slightest attention to the facts would convince him that in the ancient world Slavery was universal, that the Old Testament mitigated it, and that the New Testament did much—probably more than anything else—to abolish it.

Our experience is limited to a single lecture, and may have been exceptional. But so far as it goes, we should say that Mr. Ingersoll is eminently spicy and will, in that respect, well repay his hearers, or such of them as care for spiciness in the treatment of such subjects; but that his arguments are really telling only against the most irrational and obsolete orthodoxy, while the temper which his style tends to produce in his hearers is far from being that which is most needed in the search for truth.

THE BYSTANDER.

MAY, 1880.

AT Ottawa three weeks were wasted in an altercation, miscalled a debate, about the Budget. Utterly wasted they were, for not one of the speakers attempted to give a fair account of the results of the N. P. in his own district. It was a mere series of party tirades on both sides. As the first word was uttered, Truth waved her wing to alight in that Hall no more. In a little Working Man's paper published at Toronto, which lies before us, there is a dialogue of three working men on the N. P., which from the working-man's point of view contains more sense in a few lines than was uttered in three weeks in the House of Commons. "I'm willing to give it time, though I must say I thought wages would have gone up"—is about all that there is really to be said at present. The deficit is partly filled. What the effects of the new system on industry will be, setting aside such casual advantages as the harvest of last year, remains yet to be seen. That the good done must be very limited, we know. A tariff which is framed with a view of doing justice to our own industries is an improvement on one which was not, and the government which framed it will, in that respect, be commended by all who hold that in commercial matters, as well as in others, it is the special duty of a government to protect the interests of its own citizens. But no man of sense imagines that prosperity can be created by an increase of taxation.

On both sides the Tariff is treated as a measure of Protection. The addition to the coal duty is Protectionist, being imposed avowedly with the object of compelling Ontario to use Nova Scotian coal. But there is nothing to take the Tariff, as a whole, out of the category of revenue tariffs. An addition to the revenue was imperatively required to fill the deficit produced by an extremely expensive form of government, and by making political railways. An increase of duties, consequently, was inevitable, and recourse must have been had to it whichever party had been in power. The only subject for discussion, therefore, is the scheme of adjustment, and as to this we shall scarcely be in a position to form a satisfactory opinion, until some counter scheme has been propounded on the other side. The weak point of the whole policy, in our own eyes, is the general basis of Isolation on which it rests. It is constructed on the principle of cutting us off, for political purposes, from the continent of which our country is economically a part, instead of obeying the dictates of nature, and embracing the advantages which she has set before us. It condemns Canada anew to the commercial atrophy which such severance inevitably produces, and which is the main cause of her commercial ills, and of the present exodus of her citizens. But the leaders and the organs of both parties are Separatists, and denounce Commercial Union as treason. In that respect they all stand on the same platform, which, if ever the commercial interest of our people should prevail over Anti-American sentiment, will give way alike under them all.

—At last the N. P. wrangle was over, and Mr. Blake, by his notice of resolution to postpone the construction of the railway in British Columbia, gave the signal for the really important debate of the Session. He gave the signal for something else at the same time. The *Globe* had watched in eloquent silence his return to Parliament and his progress towards the leadership of the Opposition. It now came down upon him, with an editorial of impressive length, defending the great national en-

terprise, and branding as an Annexationist the presumptuous politician who dared at once to propose an interference with its prosecution and himself to come forward as an independent leader of the Opposition. This time, however, Mr. Blake stood firm; and the effect of his firmness soon appeared. The next editorial betrayed, what one of our contemporaries called in language graphic, though perhaps not classical, "a decided weakening towards Mr. Blake." The Grit journal made haste to put away the reproach which had evidently been addressed to it behind the scenes, of playing into the hands of the Tory Government, and its party chastity was vindicated in an amusing way, at the expense of poor Sir Charles Tupper. Sir Charles, finding himself under the mistletoe of patriotism with the *Globe*, ventured to steal a kiss. He must have been rather taken aback by the gentle dame's response:

"We admit that we have not done justice to Sir Charles Pecksniff, but who could? It is as impossible to truly set him forth as to traduce him. He used his position as Minister of his own Province to feather his nest at the public expense in other cases besides that of the Springhill coal mine. He is certainly the most corrupt administrator that ever held office in Canada. He jobbed with the Carillon contractors as soon as he had succeeded to Mr. Mackenzie's department; he handed over sections A. and B. of the Thunder Bay Branch to his friends at a loss to the country of $634,958; his intimates are the contract-brokers and "sharks" of the Capital. Select at random six men of his own party, and at least four of them will say in private that, 'it is impossible to stand Tupper.' Under such circumstances Tupper may forgive the *Globe*, but the *Globe* cannot forgive Tupper. He is a nuisance to be abated."

This, it must be owned, is very pleasant reading for the members of a community, which, for the purposes of a great national enterprise, has entrusted the expenditure of a hundred millions to "Sir Charles Pecksniff's" hands.

The debate, especially the speech of Mr. Blake, brought again to the mind of the country the history of an enterprise, utterly out of proportion, as every sane man will in private say, to the resources of the nation; undertaken without surveys, without

estimates, without proper exploration of the country; and which, instead of consolidating Confederation, is likely, if prosecuted according to the present scheme, to place its integrity in the utmost peril by bringing it to financial disaster. A proviso was inserted in the contract that the burden of taxation should not be increased: but money could not be borrowed for a colossal undertaking without raising the interest in taxes, and the proviso has, of course, been given to the winds. It remains on paper only to condemn out of their own mouths those who, shrinking, as they signed the fatal bond, from the danger into which they were rushing, tried by the insertion of this illusory safeguard to hide the character of their act from themselves and from the country.

Mr. Blake's Resolution was defeated, as we had been warned it would be, by "a strict party vote," the *Globe* drawing away one man, and only one, from the Liberal side. Everybody knows what a strict party vote means, and what relation it bears to sincere conviction. The Ministerialists had been made safe in caucus, to which here, as in the United States national affairs are being transferred from the open Parliament where they are transacted under the inconvenient inspection of the people. The Government was desperately committed, and powerful interests of various kinds have by this time been formed in connection with the Road. But it may be surmised that, in the caucus, to keep the Eastern Province men in line, something was promised in the shape of caution and delay. Whether anything more was promised will presently appear. The country has been awakened; but a far greater effect would have been produced, had the leaders of the Opposition been at liberty to deal freely with the whole question. Their own policy hung round their necks. Mr. Mackenzie must wish that he had followed his own convictions, instead of yielding to conventional opinion and Lord Dufferin. But what is so rare as political courage?

An important—we may say all-important—point was brought out, though rather in the way of omission than expression,

by the debate, and notably by the very able and exhaustive speech of the Minister of Railways. The construction of the road along the North Shore of Lake Superior has been abandoned. The railway connection with Manitoba, and consequently with everything beyond, is to be by a road running through American territory. This is a virtual renunciation of the Imperial, political, and military character of the whole enterprise. Lake Superior could not be commanded in case of war: it is therefore no more to be relied on as a military connection than, with its waters frozen more than half the year and the disadvantage of a double trans-shipment, it is likely to form a commercial connection, when there is an all-rail route. As to political relations, they follow, as Sir Charles Tupper truly says, the great lines of commerce. Manitoba and all that lies beyond will remain severed from Canada, in a political and military point of view, not only by distance, and in the case of British Columbia by mountain barriers, but by foreign territory through which our only access practically will lie. Patriotism, therefore, whether Imperial or Canadian, has henceforth little to say to the matter, and we have no occasion to bandy words upon that topic. There is the engagement, of course, with British Columbia, the penalty of cancelling which may, possibly, be the loss of that member of the Confederation. But otherwise the question is now one of a purely commercial kind. Is it worth while for Canada to incur the expense of constructing a railroad over the Rocky Mountains, and of running it when it is constructed, in order to open up British Columbia, a Province with a population, at the outside, of fifteen thousand, and, according to one authority, who at all events would not speak wildly, containing no more arable land than there is in a good Ontario county? Are there no more pressing objects—no safer investments, nearer home? The expense, when the road is constructed, of running it through a desert, is left out of sight by Ministerial speakers, whose fancy peoples the route with teeming millions as soon as the road is opened: but the experience of the Intercolonial is a warning on this

point, though the route of the Intercolonial is neither so complete a wilderness, nor anything like so full of difficulty in winter as the Rocky Mountains. As to the railway within British Columbia, it may or may not be a good investment in itself: according to the *Globe* it is; according to Mr. Blake and Mr. Mackenzie it is not. But till we have opened a communication, what business, commercially speaking, have we there? Are we to build a road on the other side of the Rocky Mountains and take our chance of getting access to it through the mountains when it is built?

—As to the North-Western Territory, the die is cast. The road is actually under construction. Those territories, commercially speaking, as Sir Alexander Galt truly says, do not belong to us any more than to the people of Yorkshire or Tipperary; he might add, than to the people of the United States, or of any other country in the world, all mankind being alike at liberty to take up land. It is not, therefore, for ourselves specially that we are opening up the North-West: perhaps, in some respects, it may be against ourselves. In the same number of the *Globe* with the editorial in favour of the National Enterprise, we find the following paragraph:—

"A Lobo correspondent of the London *Advertiser* says:—During the last twelve months farm property has depreciated fully 25 per cent. As for farm stock, implements, etc., such are the operations of the N. P. that they are fairly given away. A good plough, $3.25; another plough, $1.25; a reaping machine, combined, for $85; a double waggon, $12; a set of double harness, $1.25; and other goods and wares in proportion. The people are looking westward."

No unprejudiced man needs to be told that the cause is the "looking westward" rather than the "N. P."

Still we may avoid loss, perhaps we may gain, if the money raised by the sale of land in the North-West proves sufficient to pay for the construction of the road, and for running it when

it is constructed. This again will depend upon the rate of immigration. A table has been put into the hands of Sir John Macdonald, showing that there will be 550,000 immigrants in the course of the next ten years. The *Globe* thinks it not extravagant to expect a million within a shorter period. Lord Beaconsfield overshoots them both. We speak advisedly in saying that persons thoroughly well-qualified to judge are far less sanguine. There can be no certainty at present, the most recent reports showing that the country has as yet been very imperfectly explored, while much depends on the price of wheat, which is now pouring into the English market from several quarters, including India. Ten years hence, perhaps, experience will have struck the balance between the advantages and the disadvantages of the North-West—its fruitfulness on the one side; its remoteness, its grasshoppers, and the rigour of its climate on the other. It must be borne in mind that the golden estimates are those of optimists, who were just as sanguine before they even knew that the country contained coal.

That fancy and temper can play their part in these calculations as well as arithmetic, may be seen by a comparison of the language of the *Globe* one day with its language on the next:—

"The Thunder Bay branch, 404 miles long, will be completed, without objection from any one, in 1883, and all admit that the 900 miles from Selkirk to the Rocky Mountains should be pushed on as rapidly as may be necessary to induce settlement. It would not indicate extravagant hope to say that 1,000,000 people will be in the North-West Territories by the time that the 1,300 miles already considered have been constructed. But let us say that only 500,000 people are then in the North-West. If they contribute to the Dominion treasury in the same proportion as the people of the other Provinces, they will increase the revenue by $3,000,000 a year. The 1,300 miles of railway we treat of will certainly not cost

"Sir John's calculation to show that $71,305,000 will have accrued to the treasury from the next ten years' sales of North-West lands reminds one of the fabled milkmaid who proposed to sell her pailful of milk for so much and buy eggs the chickens of which would sell for enough to pay for a hog, which would breed enough little pigs to sell for the price of a cow, which in a very short time would breed calves, which would soon grow up to cowhood, and by breeding in their turn enable her to buy a farm and establish a very extensive dairy. We are not going to deny that 750,000 people may settle in the North-West during the next ten years, but if so many go there under the present regulations, it is safe to say that

more than $30,000,000 when completed and equipped. That sum represents an annual payment of interest of $1,200,000, so that no less than $1,800,000 would remain to the good. Part of it would, of course, go in expenses of government and protection for the 500,000 people contributing the whole, but it is easy to see that the Dominion has nothing to lose by carrying the Pacific Railway to the Rocky Mountains at an early date."—*Globe, April 6th.*

one-half more would go in if the regulations were changed as we wish.'—*Globe, April 7th.*

In the first article the *Globe* is attacking Mr. Blake, under the usual pseudonym; in the second it is attacking Sir John Macdonald. In the first a certain principle of calculation is adopted; in the second it is covered with ridicule.

As to the vast addition to the revenue which the Government expects from the consumption of dutiable articles in Manitoba, we must repeat what we said before. When Manitoba is big enough to consume a vast amount of dutiable articles, she will be too big to let her tariff be regulated by Canada: she will trade with whom she pleases, and as the border antipathy does not exist in her case, she will probably choose to resort to her natural markets, which are those of the United States. Besides, how can we hope to keep to ourselves for fiscal purposes a traffic which will not be within a ring-fence, but will have to go in bond over foreign territory?

Our people would see the facts of the case and the nature of the enterprise better if they could have before them an economical as well as a political map of the Dominion. In the political map the Dominion appears as a compact half-continent. In an economical map, marking off the cultivable land from the irreclaimable desert, it would appear as four distinct regions of different sizes, with uncultivable tracts, and in one case, a vast mountain chain, between. Speaking roughly, we might call them four great irregular projections of the temperate and fertile parts of the continent into its inhospitable Northern zone. A glance would tell any one that to clamp these four regions together with railroads is a desperate undertaking for a country of such moderate resources as ours. Those who counselled the

undertaking and push it on, though patriots, are Imperial patriots, politicians whose aims and sentiments, like their knighthoods, are distinctively Imperial. Let them get the Imperial country to grant the money for railroads through the Rocky Mountains, and round the north of Lake Superior. All will then be well. The money it ought to be, not a guarantee, which is little better than an illusion and a snare.

Our statesmen find themselves compelled to put up with the natural railway route to Manitoba through the territory of the United States. This ought to make them conscious that the time has come for choosing definitely between two commercial policies. Are we to regard the inhabitants of the rest of the continent commercially as enemies, and to fight them; or are we to regard them as partners in the continent and to share with them, and when circumstances render it desirable, construct in concert with them, the highways of trade? In a war, we should contend against a far longer purse; and the object would all the time be slipping away from us, for whether we look to banks, telegraphs, railways, or any other department, we see that whatever may be the theory of the politicians, commercial union is practically going on. But the man who takes either course, and pursues it, consistently, may be a statesman. He who halts between the two, incurring enormous expense, yet swerving from his mark, constructing a gigantic railway at a distance, on the principle of hostility, yet content to leave his only access to it dependent on good-will, is surely undeserving of the name.

—Is the condition of Canada such that she can be launched without fear into boundless expenditure for a remote or sentimental object? The *Journal of Commerce*, in an article on the Financial Position, tells us that the country is "annually piling up a gigantic debt;" that it is "drifting into bankruptcy;" that "the day of reckoning is assuredly near;" and these, if the world is not mistaken, are the words of a man who is personally responsible for the situation. The limits of indirect taxation have been reached, yet the deficit is not filled; and the Finance

Minister is compelled to have recourse to inflation. An exodus to the United States is going on from all the Provinces. As many as 300 persons went from St. John in one week, and 400 from Montreal. An inquiry made by the London *Advertiser* shows that numbers are leaving Ontario, and most of them for the States. You may call those who have a regard for their material interests "political hogs," and taunt them with "caring for nothing but a full trough," but this will not keep starving men from seeking bread. From Quebec we hear that merchants still complain of the lack of business; that masses of money are lying idle in the banks for want of investments; that the poorer classes are on the verge of destitution; that families have subsisted through the winter on potatoes; that 3000 French Canadians have been in the receipt of organized relief; that every one seems compelled to retrench; that the value of real property has frightfully shrunk; and that the number of houses and stores to let is alarming. Yet these people are contributing out of their penury to the construction of a railway through the Rocky Mountains for an Imperial object of the most visionary kind. Their present representatives, it is true, vote for that object. But they were not elected on this issue. They were elected on the issue of N. P. It is safe to say that if the Government were to go to the country now, on the issue of economy and retrenchment, with regard to railways aid generally, it would certainly lose many seats and most likely be defeated.

Our humble plea for oblivion of party on this question had the misfortune to appear to one of our contemporaries a Ministerial trick "learned in Stadacona Hall." Our own impression is that there is not much to be learned in Stadacona Hall beyond the lessons taught by the example of a statesman who knows how to lay politics aside in his social hour, and is large minded enough to bear with opinions different from his own. Our grounds for making the appeal were, first, that the leaders of both parties are pretty much in the same boat, all of them having taken upon themselves more or less the responsibility of

the Pacific Railway, and, secondly, that the financial position of their common country, in the opinion of the most competent judges, is now perilous in the extreme.

—Sir Charles Tupper boldly predicts a new era of prosperity for the Intercolonial Railway. He leaves out of sight the fact that the natural route from the Maritime Provinces to Quebec will soon be open through the State of Maine. Is he so sanguine as to believe that Commerce will avoid the natural route, and go a long way round in deference to political considerations?

—Prince Edward Island petitions against the N. P. The N. P. is merely an adjustment of the Tariff, which, at all events, cannot have done much harm. It is the increase of the taxes, not their apportionment among the different kind of goods, that really pinches, and this was rendered necessary by the expenditure. Let Prince Edward Island petition for a reduction of the cost of government and against the construction of railways in British Columbia.

—The Printing Contract revelations are scandalous, and they are not without their bearing on the subject last discussed. Nobody can suppose that these practices are confined to printing. They extend, beyond doubt, to public contracts generally, and we have now in connection with the Pacific Railway a vast contractors' interest, tugging, we may be sure, with all its force at the strings of government, and supporting with all the influence at its command a policy of expenditure. Whatever may be the financial consequences of the enterprise to the nation, private fortunes will be made, and perhaps carried off, to be enjoyed in the Imperial country. This is not the least serious part of a large outlay on public works in such a community as ours.

—The Militia has had its annual talk. Nobody, in face of a deficit and the British Columbian Railway, proposes an increased vote. The only question is how the small sum at present voted

shall be spent? Shall we have a very diminutive army, or an annual camping-out in uniform on a larger scale? Volunteers it is always said, are first-rate material: so they are, if the enemy would only have the kindness to give you time at the beginning of a war to work the material up; even so, it would hardly be possible to provide good non-commissioned officers, the joints and sinews of a regiment. Only that perfectly mechanical obedience to the word of command which thorough drill imparts will enable a corps to move without becoming disorganized on a field of battle, where, as soon as the firing begins, nine men out of ten lose their presence of mind: so say the soldiers, and any one who has even witnessed a sham fight can easily believe them. Behind lines, undisciplined marksmen may be of use, but a country cannot be defended behind lines. On the other hand, the annual drill probably produces good effects moral and social, on the men called out. The choice between the two objects depends on our belief in the possibility of a Yankee war, which, as it is an article of political orthodoxy, we shall not presume to discuss. It is only to be hoped that the million of native-born Canadians now on the south of the line will not be compelled to fight upon the Yankee side.

—The measure in relation to the currency has taken a singular, and, we should think, entirely novel form. The issue of paper is to be increased from twelve millions to twenty, and the Finance Minister is to hold, for the redemption of the notes, an amount equal to twenty-five per cent. in gold and *Dominion securities guaranteed by the Government of the United Kingdom.* In other words he is to hold his own indebtedness for the redemption of his debt. The British Chancellor of the Exchequer would see with interest this unexpected use of a Railway guarantee. The measure, as we have said before, though relating to the currency, is not, in its main object, a currency measure: it is a forced loan, of which the banks are compelled to be the instruments as the price of renewal of their charters. This is its real character, and, as we venture to think, its sufficient con-

demnation, little as Sir Leonard Tilley himself meditates any departure from the paths of sound and honest finance. But it is not surprising that it should also have been hailed as a step towards irredeemable paper, the devotees of which have broken forth into singing:

> "Then hurrah for Sir Leonard, his 6,000,000 of scrip,
> Forecasts a big feast of which eight 's but a nip."

There are those who refuse to believe in the story of Jonah; but they are forced to believe in the existence of highly educated and intelligent men who are persuaded that they can make a nation rich by printing the word dollar on so many millions of slips of paper. It is said that the reason why the people of the United States are so rich is, that they have more paper money *per capita* than any other nation. We rather doubt the fact. We suspect that the first place in the enviable list belongs to Turkey. But what has *per capita* to do with it? How much paper money would it take to carry on the business of forty millions of paupers? The people of the United States require a large amount of paper because they are very wealthy, and their transactions are numerous and large. This, not the converse, is the fact. Those who do more business, require more notes, as they require more checks: multiplying checks would not increase our fortunes.

That there is too little money in the country nobody can imagine who knows anything about the state of the money market and the Banks. The Banks are overloaded, and people are on their knees for investments. A reduction of the rate of interest on mortgage is evidently taking place, and is likely to go on with increased rapidity. It is compelling all the Building Societies to reduce the interest on deposits. If Commerce is allowed to regulate her own concerns, the volume of paper currency will expand and contract with the needs of the country: if politicians meddle there will be gain of votes to them and commercial disaster to their constituents.

—In Quebec the Government seems disposed to take the full length of its tether and not to meet Parliament before the 30th of June, when the estimates will expire. It has trouble not only with the Opposition, but with a section of its own supporters, who are uncompromising Conservatives and want no coalition. In the meantime the Treasury is empty, the Dominion Government has not yet bought the North Shore Railway; the old claim against the Dominion has come to nothing. In the hope, it would appear, that any change will bring relief, it is proposed to revive dual representation. The abolition of government by faction, if it were possible, would be much more to the purpose. In this lies the only hope of economy, as well as the only hope of integrity.

—The Building Societies have furnished matter for a lively debate, in which they were well represented. Laws limiting the rate of interest are absurd. The effect of them would be to prohibit any one who had not the best security to offer from borrowing at all, even in his utmost need. Practically, such persons would pay a most exorbitant rate, because the lender would have to protect himself against the risk of illegality as well as against that of bad security; so that, instead of relief being afforded to the objects of Dr. Orton's philanthropy, their burden would be immeasurably increased. The point to which legislation should be directed is the deceptive character of the table rates, by which ignorant borrowers, it is to be feared, are sometimes led to saddle themselves with interest at the rate of nine per cent. when they fancy they are only to pay six. In a case of positive misrepresentation, we presume, there might, as it is, be a remedy in a court of law.

Another matter for serious consideration is the character of the business now done by these Societies, or some of them, as receivers of deposits. It is in fact a banking business carried on without those safeguards which, in the interest of the depositor, the law requires in the case of Banks. The money

deposited is, of course, all locked up in mortgages, and a Building Society holding a large amount on call or on short notice, would, in case of a run, be compelled either to sell mortgages, which, at a time of panic, might be difficult, or to fly for succour to the Banks, which might themselves be caught in the same storm. That a part of their legitimate business is filched from the Banks, is not the worst part of the system: the worst part of it is the danger to which depositors are inevitably exposed. That the deposits are all invested in real securities is perfectly true, but it is true at the same time, that they are locked up, and would not be forthcoming on demand. A law prohibiting Building Societies for the future from receiving deposits for a shorter period than six months, would deprive the Societies of no business that properly belongs to them, while it might avert a serious danger from the public.

—It will soon be decided whether General Grant is to be the nominee of the Republican party. The question lies in the first instance between him and Blaine. Against both, and the machine by which they are thrust upon the party as candidates, there is a noble and hopeful revolt among the more independent Republicans. In the progress of this revolt lies, at present, the great interest of American politics. It testifies to the existence outside the party organizations and everything that they control, of a strong element of good citizenship which cares only for honest government. The Americans are a reading people: and their reading is not confined to the daily papers. The daily papers are better than the politicians; they saved the currency, when the politicians would have debased it and ruined commerce to catch votes; but as a rule, they are necessarily under the control of party. The weeklies and the magazines are not under the control of party: the most successful of them are thoroughly independent; their circulation is immense, their influence is great, and it has been generally exercised for good. Another important source of independent thought and action

are the colleges, which send forth a constant stream of young men highly educated, trained in a generous patriotism and in healthy hatred of roguery, able to use both their tongues and pens with good effect, and most of them possessed of social advantages which multiply their personal powers. The political-machine-breakers are nick-named the Young Scratchers. They include men of all ages, as the Pennsylvanian manifesto, headed by Mr. Lea and Mr. Rosengarten, shows. Yet there are truth and significance in the word young: a revolt against corruption is sure to number in its ranks a large proportion of educated youths. Moreover, the rising generation, as its political memory hardly goes back to the Civil war, cares less than its seniors about the regular party issue of the Bloody Shirt, and more about evils and dangers which have not been buried in the grave of Secession. Party ties are still tremendously strong; but the Scratchers have shown such a front as to make it doubtful whether the machinists will venture on the nomination of Grant or even of Blaine. There may yet be a chance for Edmunds, if he does not persist in his refusal: we wish we could think there might be a chance for Garfield. If the choice should fall on Sherman, the successful financier, or even on Grant's friend Washburne, there would not be much reason for complaint as far as the man himself was concerned. The Democrats are at a loss for a candidate, Bayard having been unfortunately killed by the pestilent revival of his forgotten speech against the coercion of the South; Thurman has flirted with Greenbackism; Horatio Seymour, who is generally respected and would probably win, is understood to be prevented from running by his health; Tilden retires, in consequence, as the brilliant humourist of the New York *Times* says, of the result of a post mortem examination: and beyond these, all is darkness.

The members of the National Republican League, in a manifesto against the Third Term, dwell on Grant's failure as a statesman; his apparent fancy that the government was his personal property; and the fatal pregnancy of his saying that "he would never abandon a friend under fire," in other words, that he would

feel it his duty to uphold a partisan convicted of the grossest corruption against the interest of the commonwealth. They proceed to point out the growing danger of the "Boss" system under which all political power is being gradually drawn into the hands of managers such as Cameron and Conkling; and they show how easily, without any formal change of institutions, the free Republic might in this way be gradually transmuted into a "Boss" Empire. They say with truth, that the farce of a plebiscite may continue to be enacted, as it was under the French Empire, when popular liberty has really ceased to exist, adding that "whether a Monarch is called a President, an Emperor, or a Boss, is simply a question of terms and taste." They dwell on the military character of General Grant's candidature and the sinister import of the suggestion whispered by his partisans that he has half a million of veterans behind him. On this point perhaps they might speak even more strongly than they do: to foreign observers at least, it appears that the mere violation of the traditional rule against a Third Term is the least serious part of the matter: the most serious being the violation of the rule for the special purpose of installing a "man on horseback," whose recommendation is his personal command of force, who is to begin by counting himself in, and to whose reign no limit is assigned. We have already said that we entirely acquit General Grant himself of criminal ambition: it is not in his character; but he covets the Presidency, and his desire makes him an instrument in the hands of "Boss" intrigue.

—"The Great Republic," is the subject of a chapter in the Duke of Somerset's "Monarchy and Democracy." The Duke used to be a member of Whig Governments; he dropped out when the leadership passed into the hands of Gladstone, his dislike of whom ruffles, in one part of his treatise, his philosophic calm. His view of the political world is doleful; in aristocracy he apparently sees some good; in other institutions little or none. His mode of reasoning, however, is hardly fair. He inquires

whether representation or popular education is a panacea, and having easily proved that it is not, he flings it aside as a total failure. Nothing is a panacea: if the Duke will examine the political, social and moral state of England during the last century, when aristocracy reigned supreme, he will find that some evils still remained. The corruption with which he too justly taxes American politicians, is purity compared with that which reigned in the English Parliament under Newcastle and Bute. Nor was the "trade of politics" plied by the borough-mongers one whit less vile than that plied by American wire-pullers. On the other hand, if he will spend a few months in a rural district of any one of the more settled States of the Union, and compare the general condition of the people with their condition in Europe, he will see that an institution which is not a panacea may nevertheless be an improvement. He will find that society in the main is sound; that life and property, even the extreme rights of property, are secure; that trade is honest; that intelligence, as well as opulence and comfort, is widely diffused; that regard for the public good and for public objects of all kinds is strong and active; that the heart and hand of charity are open; that life is in a reasonable degree pure, civilized and happy: and he will note that all this rests upon a secure foundation, with no volcano slumbering beneath. Moralizing on these facts, he will admit that some progress has been made: nobody but a dreamer or a doctrinaire expects more. The political abuses are undeniable; but their main causes are manifest and are not incapable of being removed; the better element of the nation, as we have seen, is in arms against them: and there can be no kind of doubt that it has a great body of opinion on its side. Even, of the political abuses, the Duke may be assured that he has heard the worst. The two parties, especially on the eve of a Presidential election, watch each other with lynx eyes, and any act of corruption, though it be merely personal, is joyfully pounced upon by ten thousand hostile journals, and inflated to the dimensions of a vast party

crime. Let us at least see what the Young Scratchers can do before we decide that there is no hope for the Republic.

"The Americans," says the Duke, "are in their hearts an aristocratic people living under democratic institutions. This sentiment frequently peeps out from under the domino which the Republic forces them to wear." These words betray the sources of the Duke's information. It is too true that wealthy Americans of the baser sort, when they creep into the society of European rank, do comport themselves in the most servile manner; and they naturally produce, in minds eager to credit the tale, the belief that their countrymen are a nation of flunkeys only restrained from manifesting their happy tendencies by a nominal deference to republican institutions. But if the Duke hopes that the domino will ever fall off, he is doomed to another political disappointment. Great disasters may occur: in the struggle which is going on the evil may prevail: it is even conceivable, though by no means likely, that Cæsarism may find its way to the New World; but the domain of aristocracy is bounded by the Atlantic. Toryism has been gloating over Mr. Sala's description of the fast men and women of New York. Those men and women, no doubt, in snobbishness as in all other kinds of vileness, justify Mr. Sala's picture: but they are not the people of the United States.

—In speaking of the English Elections we renounced prediction, but had we prophesied we should have been wrong. At the time of our writing a reduction of the Government majority was the utmost which we thought probable. It was the utmost which the Liberal leaders in England themselves thought probable. The London correspondent of the Manchester *Examiner*, who is thoroughly well-informed, evidently considered that if the Government majority could be reduced to a single figure it would be a great triumph. The London *Times* had been for some time written in the confident belief that the Tories would win, and win on the special issue of Foreign

Policy, where the *Times* was sure that they had the country with them. So much do the Clubs know about the real sentiments of the people! Just at the last, however, the omens grew brighter for the Liberals. It was pretty clear that they had patched up the differences which were their chief weakness: patching up it was with a vengeance when they accepted as their candidate at Newcastle Mr. Cowen, whose Jingo speeches were being joyfully circulated by the Tories. How much their adversaries counted on these divisions in the Liberal camp and how sedulously they endeavoured to improve them was seen at Leicester, where the Tory agent was detected in offering an advanced Radical a large bribe to come forward as an independent candidate, on a platform of Temperance, Trade Unions, and Anti-Compulsory Vaccination. It was evident, also, that Lord Beaconsfield's manifesto had missed its mark, and that his leading partisans were ashamed to endorse it, while the declaration of Lord Derby that the rash enterprises of the Government threatened the stability of the Empire was a shot between wind and water and was sure to tell.

—The fortunes of the battle, however, followed pretty much the lines which we had traced. The Tories were strongest in the English counties and in London. The Liberal victory was most decisive in Scotland. The great interests, including beer, went as we had anticipated. The Liberals gained considerably in the small boroughs, where we said that the scale might be turned by a slight weight, such as the dread of an increased income tax among the poorer payers of the tax, or even that weariness of the existing Government, and willingness to try something new, which is manifestly becoming a momentous influence in politics under the elective system, and seems likely to limit the duration of party governments to a single Parliament. The Stock Exchange voted for Lord Beaconsfield as its best patron: the Jews voted for upholding their "persecuted" brethren in Roumania, whose usury is despoiling the Roumanian peasant of his freehold: the Anglo-Israelites voted for a

foreign policy in harmony with the principle that the British, as the descendants of the Lost Tribes, are destined to inherit the earth.

The excitement brought out an immense vote on both sides. Some have ascribed the vast Liberal gain to the appearance upon the scene of the populace enfranchised by the Tory Reform Bill of 1867, who it is assumed, had not exercised the suffrage before. Were this the truth, the engineer would have been hoist with his own petard. But he knew his game too well. The "residuum" voted in 1874 and voted Tory. Nobody who witnessed that election can doubt the fact. Dislike and fear of the foreign policy of the late Government, stimulated by the powerful appeals of Mr. Gladstone, called out multitudes who are usually indifferent and who probably belong in the main to the Middle Class. It would seem that in some counties there had been a slight Liberal movement among the farmers, who have reason enough just now for dissatisfaction; but this is not very clear.

We said that the literary and intellectual element was in great measure on the Liberal side. The election of Tories by acclamation at both the great English universities may seem to cast doubt upon this statement. But the residents who are the really academical element would, both at Oxford and Cambridge, have elected Liberals by an overwhelming majority; the Tory strength lies among the non-residents, Masters of Arts who have votes in Parliamentary elections, and who include a great mass of country clergymen and country squires. The history of Oxford and Cambridge in a political point of view is curious as an example of the influence of mere accident. In the Middle Ages, they belonged, like the Universities of Europe generally, to the Liberal and progressive party; they were in fact the workshops of political as well as intellectual liberty, and played an important part on the side of freedom in the struggle between the Crown and the nation, which gave birth to the Great Charter and the House of Commons. But the Fellows of Colleges were bound, as a body, by their statutes to

take Orders at a certain standing. In the Middle Ages this rule was comparatively of little significance because the clergy then was not so much a profession as an estate, embracing all who were devoted to intellectual pursuits of any kind, even to architecture, or the higher mechanics; so that "clerkly" was a synonym for learned, and the possession of literary acquirements was the legal evidence of a title to be a member of the order. But after the Reformation intellectual pursuits generally passed into the hands of laymen: the clergy were confined to the pastoral office, and became a clearly defined profession: and as the Fellows of Colleges constituted almost the entire governing and teaching body at the Universities and the mediæval statutes requiring them to take Orders remained unrepealed, Oxford and Cambridge assumed a strictly clerical character, became entirely identified with clerical studies, sympathies and antipathies, confined instruction to the ancient languages, excluded science, and attached themselves to the political fortunes of the Tory party, because the Tory party upheld the Established Church. Whenever there has been a contest, it has been found that the great majority of the class men, and the men distinguished in literature or science, was on the Liberal side.

In enumerating the forces we ought perhaps to have specially noticed Wales, where the Liberal success in agricultural counties is usually greater than it is in England. Wales is still in some measure a separate nation, with a language and a religion of its own. The language, as well as the general isolation of the district, is giving way before railways and extension of intercourse: its decline is in fact hastened by the very means which Welsh patriotism takes to keep it alive; for the cultivation of Welsh literature excites a thirst for literature generally which the Welsh rivulet is too scanty to allay. But in the meantime there is a sharp division between the farmers and shopkeepers, who are Welsh, and the gentry who are English, which gives an opening for popular candidates, especially if they can speak the language of the people.

The national religion is Calvinistic Methodism of the fervent kind congenial to the Celt, who in Wales and the Scotch Highlands is a Protestant, in France and Ireland a Roman Catholic, everywhere an enthusiast and a devotee. But the clergy of the Establishment are Anglicans who sometimes preach to congregations as small as those to which the rectors of the Protestant Establishment used to preach in Ireland; so that a difference of religion is added to the difference of race. The result is a double antagonism of the Welsh peasantry and their religious leaders to the alien squirearchy and to the alien Church. It is not impossible that Wales, from its religious peculiarities, may form the second stage in the gradual process of Disestablishment, as Ireland has formed the first.

When victory began to declare for the Liberals it was an anxious question whether their majority would be large enough to enable them to govern without the Home Rulers. It seems certain that it is. Finding that such was likely to be the case, Mr. Parnell,* in the middle of the battle, wheeled round and turned his influence and his vocabulary against the winning side. But in this abrupt right-about-face, he broke off several joints of his tail, and he was too late to save the strong Irish vote in the North of England, which had already been given for the Liberals. His fantastic dictatorship is probably near its end. He has evidently aroused the jealousy and offended the better sense of a number of his own party. Both as a Protestant and as a political revolutionist he is viewed with an evil eye by the priests: in the House of Commons he will find himself confronted by a victorious party commanding a clear and sure majority; he will no longer be able to reckon on the strength which he secretly derived, during the last two sessions, from the fear of the Irish vote at the impending election. Above all, he will have lost Lord Beaconsfield, who, though he deemed it expedient, as a matter of tactics,

* In speaking of Mr. Parnell's mistake with regard to the pedigree of the Duchess of Marlborough, we inadvertently used an expression implying that Sarah Jennings had no descendants. She has descendants in the female line.

to make opposition to Home Rule his election cry, would no more have scrupled to intrigue with the Home Rulers for the subversion of Liberal government, than he had in intriguing, when it suited him, with the group of Ultramontane members called the Pope's Brass Band; with the "Tea-roomers" of the extreme Liberal Left; with the "Adullamites" of the extreme Liberal Right; with the Ritualists, out of whom he subsequently tried to make capital by legislating for their suppression; or with the Radical opponents of Lord Palmerston's Conspiracy Bill, whom he at other times denounced as revolutionists and harbourers of assassins. The whole course of Vivian Grey has been a series of these strokes of strategy; and that he would not have shrunk from a temporary alliance with Home Rule may be surmised from the letter of congratulation which he addressed to Lord Castlereagh, on the election of that nobleman as a Home Ruler for the County of Down. Conservative leaders of the more steady-going kind, especially if they hold estates in Ireland, are not likely to league themselves with Obstruction, merely for the purpose of bringing on a crisis, of which, after all, their party would be too weak to take advantage. Even their hatred of Mr. Gladstone would hardly carry them so far as that.

Some of our Irish friends rebuked us for "throwing cold water on Mr. Parnell." We have no desire to join in a cry against him or anybody else: if truth would permit we would rather speak for a man against the cry than join it. But Mr. Parnell seems to us the last of a line of violent and feeble agitators, who by their futile tamperings with insurrection have both injured and degraded the Irish cause. To strike for independence, if you think it necessary and practicable, is an intelligible course, though you will never enter it hopefully with a termagant rhetorician at your head. Otherwise, there is nothing for it but to act with that party in the Parliament of the United Kingdom which has shown itself most willing to do justice to Ireland. Obstruction, carried on by Parnell and Biggar, will effect nothing, as will soon be seen.

A French Liberal has said that the result of the English elections may be succinctly described as the triumph of political morality. It better becomes an English Liberal, or one who has ever been connected with the party, to record this judgment than to pronounce it himself. Certain it is, however, that Jingoism has fallen, and it is equally certain that, in its utterances as in its acts, Jingoism was a repudiation of moral restraints, and a defiance of human rights. The language of the *Pall Mall Gazette* would have seemed revolting to Pitt as well as to Wilberforce or Burke. The writers were Atheists, or, if the term is more polite, Agnostics, though for a political purpose they upheld the Established Church; and they were drawing England into courses which could only have been wise on the supposition that, provided you had might on your side, you would have to reckon with no higher power. In the broadest terms, the *Pall Mall Gazette* proclaimed that the most revolting cruelties perpetrated by the Turks formed no reason for ceasing to support their rule, if the interest of England required that it should continue. A kindred organ, the *Standard*, avowed with equal frankness that, so long as a certain course of action was "politics," it would not stop to inquire whether it was "morality." This philosophy has unquestionably bitten the dust: so far the French Liberal is right. To say the same thing in other words, England has been called upon to choose between Industrialism, or the path of honest labour, in which she has hitherto prospered, and Militarism, or the path of aggrandizement into which the Jingo government, with the aid of a rising class of military adventurers, would have lured her; and by a decisive vote, Industrialism has prevailed. Nor can there be much doubt that the classes in which the sound morality of a country generally resides were arrayed on this occasion against an alliance of Privilege with political Lazzaroni.

Evident it is, too, that a fatal blow has fallen on the policy of depressing the authority of Parliament and of reverting to personal government, or rather to government by a Vizier,

which had marked the administration of Lord Beaconsfield, and for which all his writings had prepared us. An Oriental in character as in blood, Lord Beaconsfield has never had any sympathy with English liberty; what he loves is the power, pomp and parade of absolute Monarchy: the subject of all his dreams has been the autocracy at which the Stuarts aimed, tricked out in the finery of the Moguls. An extraordinary outburst of flunkeyism in England, following upon the marvellous development of wealth, made his aim less chimerical than it would have seemed half a century ago. A Female reign lent itself kindly to his project, and gave full scope for the exercise of that power of flattery in which also he is more than Oriental. By the extension of the franchise to masses easily debauched, and beneath regard for Parliamentary freedom, he brought a new, though most unhallowed, force to his aid. The title of Empress was another move in the game; and a move still more important was the artful identification of India and its servile masses with the islands which had theretofore been the privileged home of freedom. An aggressive and warlike foreign policy served the same end in two ways, both as it gave a military turn to the character of the nation, and as it assigned the first place among the functions of government to one which could be withdrawn, and for some years has been sedulously withdrawn, from the cognizance and control of Parliament. That this attempt could have gone very far, that the solid work of centuries could have been undone by the tricks and phrases of a master of political legerdemain, even with social circumstances in his favour, it would be treason against English greatness to believe: but at all events it has now ended in total and shameful ruin. The aristocracy, which, as a body, made itself an accomplice in the attempt, will probably, some day, have the pleasure of paying Lord Beaconsfield's bill.

—It is a motley host that has marched to victory under the banner of the Liberal Party. Whig aristocrats such as Lord Granville, and High Churchmen such as Lord Selborne, are

divided from the Socialistic Securalist Mr. Bradlaugh, who has at last got himself elected by the revolutionary shoemakers of Northampton, by a space far wider than that which divides them from any moderate Conservative. Equally great is the distance between the ultra-pacific Mr. Bright and the ultra-Jingo Mr. Cowan. In time there is likely to be trouble from these sectional differences. There is likely to be trouble also, in time, from individual ambition. The Tory leaders have, in this respect, a much easier part to play. Few of their followers aspire to office: the mass of them are content with having their interests, as members of a territorial aristocracy, secured; being the great men in their own neighbourhood, and the dispensers of the local patronage; receiving the Minister, if he comes into their county; and getting their wives and daughters provided with invitations to Court balls. But on the Liberal side the number of aspirants is always much greater, and the list of the new Parliament portends an abundant crop of personal difficulties for the Liberal chief. A split between the sections and a coalition government of Whigs combined with Liberal Conservatives are highly probable events of the future.

For the present, however, the Liberals will be held together by recent partnership in a great struggle, and their irresistible ascendancy will give a new complexion to the policy of the country. A foreign policy cannot be abruptly changed: national consistency must be preserved, national engagements must be kept. In this point of view it might have been better for the Liberals, as a party, if their accession to power had been somewhat delayed, and their enemy had been left to deal with the consequences of his own acts. The greatness of their majority diminishes their difficulty, because it assures them of the hearty support of their own people; yet it does not render their task easy. The defensive alliance with Turkey cannot be repudiated; at least till Turkey has definitely failed to fulfil the promises of reform. At the instance of England, Austria has closed the gate of emancipation against the Christian communities of Eastern Europe, and a British Government cannot

betray her. The withdrawal from Afghanistan, on which the Liberal chiefs have no doubt resolved, cannot be allowed to wear the appearance of a flight. But a new spirit will prevail; the policy of Canning will supplant that of Castlereagh and Lord Beaconsfield; sympathy with the oppressed will take the place of sympathy with the oppressor: alliance with the living that of alliance with the dead. Greece and the young Balkan nationalities instead of the Ottoman Empire will become the clients of England, and British interests will no longer be cursed as the obstacle to their liberation by the rising communities of the Mediterranean. No isolation, no self-effacement, no loss of anything that deserves the name of honour, is implied in such a change. Swagger, of course, will cease; but it is as alien to the character of the English nation as it is to that of the English gentleman, and it is no more a source of real strength than it is of genuine dignity. The Councils of Europe, so called, are at present a conclave of great and ambitious powers each of them armed to the teeth: ascendancy in that conclave can be secured only by outvying the other powers in military expenditure; and to this, however much the national pride may be excited, and however loud may be the chanting of the music halls, the English people will not consent; for when a great increase of taxation is threatened, the mercantile spirit is strong enough to keep the war spirit within bounds. At this moment England, while she is being goaded on by the Anti-Russian party in Western Europe to a desperate struggle with Russia in the East, has virtually lost her control over questions touching her far more nearly than that of Herat or Erzeroum. If the military dead-lock in Europe should become intolerable, and the great Powers should agree to terminate it by mutual concessions at the expense of their weaker neighbours, England, entangled in the conflict with Russia, would be compelled tamely to acquiesce in the annexation of Belgium and Holland, though her maritime empire then, instead of being threatened from the Dardanelles, would be threatened from Antwerp and Amsterdam. It may even be surmised that Gambetta, when,

in the late elections, he directed the fire of his organ against the English Liberals, had Belgium in his eye, and feared that England might, by the termination of her quarrel with Russia, be less at liberty to put a veto on his design. This is more likely at all events then that so sagacious a politician should have allowed himself to be swayed by resentful recollections of the refusal of the Liberals to come to the aid of France in her last war. Such a position may be brilliant, but it can hardly be called strong. Russia has been exasperated by insult and menace as well as by opposition. This gratuitous addition to the danger will be now removed, and full play will be given to the disposition of the Czar who, beyond doubt, is personally inclined to peace. Already symptoms of softened feeling appear on the Russian side. Apart from the difficulty of restoring to tranquillity such a swarm of hornets as the Afghans themselves, when once it has been stirred, there seems no reason why the embroglio in Central Asia should not now be terminated by the permanent re-establishment of the neutral zone. The imbroglio in Asia Minor and the Balkan region can never be terminated if the English people are desperately bent on preventing a growing and expanding nation of eighty millions from ever finding access to an open sea.

—Home questions under the late government were neglected, while the mind of the voter was turned to aggrandizement abroad. They will now be restored to the first place. This in fact will be the principal change. The island kingdom cannot control the nations by arms, but it can lead them, and under Liberal guidance has led them, in political progress. The shores of few of them have been trodden by its conquering legions, but almost all now have constitutions, if not actually on the British plan, bearing distinct traces of their British origin. This leadership England may resume. If, as is far from improbable, her Liberal government can by friendly counsels help to confirm the hesitating Czar in his resolution to crown the good work of

his earlier days by inaugurating a Constitution, more would be done towards curing Russia of dangerous tendencies to military aggrandizement than can be done either by hostile menaces or diplomatic combinations. First in the list of improvements to be undertaken stands perhaps the extension of the County Franchise, to which the Liberal party is pledged, and on which apparently it will now be a unit, Mr. Lowe's former experience of the Cave of Adullam not disposing him to retire into it again. The difficulty of the question lies in the redistribution of seats which a large increase of the county constituencies would involve, and which would entail the suppression of a number of small boroughs as distinct centres of representation. In 1832 the practical evils for which a remedy was sought in the reform of the representation were so great that national feeling burst through all ties of local interest, and even proprietors of rotten boroughs voted for Reform. This is not the case at present, and Liberal statesmen are now likely to find the suppression of small boroughs perilous work, more especially as no small proportion of their recent gains has been drawn from that very source. It is to be wished, rather than hoped, that this opportunity may be taken of placing the franchise altogether on some more rational basis than that of a property qualification, which is merely an obsolete relic of the feudal age, when everything was territorial, not personal, and has been so pared away by successive reductions as to be now practically almost worthless. If to a personal qualification, such as the education test, could be added a qualification of public duty, such as liability to service on the jury lists, or in defence of the country, the elective polity would rest on a sounder and more stable, as well as a more rational foundation. Nor do we believe that the better portion of the working class is by any means hostile to a policy which would give value and dignity to the vote. As to the Suffrage Bill of 1867, it was the embodiment of an infamous intrigue, and ought to be treated as morally null.

The extension to the counties of the system of elective government already enjoyed by the boroughs, in place of the pre

sent government by the County Magistrates in Quarter Sessions assembled, is another part of the Liberal programme which is sure to be soon taken in hand. It will, probably, be accompanied by a measure of decentralization, transferring to the municipalities portions of the mass of legislation, really local in its character, by which the wheels of the central legislature are at present fatally clogged, so that, though each Session is longer than the last, and even the sacred season of grouse shooting has ceased to command religious respect, Parliament always rises with its work half done. This will be in part a return to the County Courts of early English history, if that antiquarian consideration can sweeten the loss of power to the Justices of the Peace. The House of Commons is tenacious, ridiculously tenacious, of its authority; but, of course, whatever powers are conferred on Local Councils will be subordinate to the supreme control of Westminster.

A measure of this kind was proposed long ago by writers who urged that while it would relieve Parliament of a needless burden, and give fresh life to local institutions generally, it would be of special value with regard to Ireland, and would, in fact, furnish the best solution of the Irish problem so far as the political question was concerned. The firmest adherents of the Union will hardly deny that Ireland suffers from having everything carried to Westminster, and that she would be the better for more special legislation. The Provinces present a very convenient basis for local legislatures, especially as the Protestants, who might fall out with the Catholics, are mainly congregated in Ulster. Among other Irish questions, those relating to education, with which it is difficult to deal freely at Westminster, might perhaps be advantageously left to the Irish people, who would solve them at first, no doubt, in a strongly Catholic sense, but in the end would yield to the same liberalizing influences as the rest of Europe; for Irish Ultramontanism is quite as much antagonism to England as religious bigotry. This policy, carried into effect on a liberal scale, would apparently satisfy the more moderate Home Rulers; and, though the

Parnellites would, no doubt, oppose any solution whatever, their opposition would only commend the measure to the House of Commons and the British people. It is on this line, at all events, that, in dealing with Home Rule, the Liberal party may be expected to move.

So far we may look to see the different sections of the Liberals to go together, particularly as they have had bitter experience of the fruits of jibbing on the question of Parliamentary Reform. Their union will be more severely tried by the questions of Land Law Reform and Church Disestablishment, both of which must come in course of time. With regard to Disestablishment we before remarked that the besieging army without seemed to be making less progress than the disruptive forces within. This, and the fact that so large a proportion of the English people are within the State Church, may possibly suggest a solution of the problem different from that adopted in Ireland, where the Anglican Establishment was the intrusive Church of a small minority, and its abolition was demanded by the vast majority of the people. Instead of abolition the policy finally embraced may be Comprehension. Comprehension of all Protestant denominations, with a legal provision for the clergy, was the system of the Protectorate, and during its brief period of existence, it was, even in the estimation of anti-Cromwellians like Baxter, remarkably successful. An end was put to it under the Restoration, by the Act of Uniformity and the expulsion of all the Non-conforming ministers on St. Bartholomew's Day. One mode, at all events, of dealing with the question now would be to repeal the Act of Uniformity in its turn, and revive the principle of Comprehension. The tendency to union among Protestants, on the broad basis of the Gospel, which has here recently shown itself in the interchange of pulpits, is manifested in England also, and there extends to the more liberal section of the clergy of the Establishment. The enthusiasm with which the great body of Non-conformists, including their leading ministers, have followed Mr. Gladstone, in spite of his Anglicanism, is another

proof of the disposition of religious men to draw together without reference to formal differences of creed. A change in the organization of the Church would, at the same time, be necessary; the power of the Bishop would have to be reduced, at least, to the extent proposed long ago in the liberal scheme of Bishop Usher; private patronage in the appointment of ministers would have to be abolished, and a voice, at least, would have to be given to the congregation. Those only who imagine that a merchant or a peasant thinks much of theological formularies can fear that, by such a reform, any great shock would be given to the practical religion of the people. Ritualists would no doubt be repelled, and there would probably be a secession to Rome. But a secession to Rome there must be in the end, if the Ritualists are logical and sincere. In truth, their relation to the Establishment is already that of a chronic insurrection, headed by the indomitable Mr. Mackonochie, which the Ecclesiastical Courts vainly struggle to put down. Sacerdotal Sacramentalism stands apart, incapable of any fusion. But such differences of creed as those which divide the Protestant churches are being rapidly lost in the sense of common danger arising from the rapid spread of total unbelief.

It is singular, that amidst the most extreme proposals on all other subjects, hardly a word is ever said about the Reform of the House of Lords. There are Liberals who persuade themselves that the House of Lords is an institution practically favourable to democracy, because it removes the greatest landowners from the House of Commons, where they would exercise more real power. But there can be no doubt as to the general effect of the existence of an hereditary aristocracy with a branch of the legislature in its hands. The part played by the Order in the Jingo movement shows plainly enough what it is capable of doing, and what, whenever it has an opportunity, it will do. The Liberals, if they mean business, will have some day to take the House of Lords in hand; but the day is probably yet distant, and the battle about the Land Laws will come first.

How the Liberals will deal with the Land Laws is a question of the greatest interest in a political as well as in a social point of view. In an article in the *Edinburgh*, entitled "Plain Whig Principles," we are told exactly how far that section is willing to go. The limit of its concessions is "a modification of the law of entail, with greater facilities for the liberation of encumbered estates, and for the transfer of land, under the control of a Court or Board of competent jurisdiction—a measure equally beneficial to the owners of land, to their families, and to the agricultural interest." The Radicals are probably ready to go the length, not only of modifying, but of totally abolishing, entail and reducing all ownership of land as much as possible to fee simple. We have not yet noticed any distinct movement in favour of the compulsory subdivision which keeps up a peasant proprietary in France. The Socialism which would treat all land as the property, not of individual owners, but of the State, may find one spokesman in Mr. Bradlaugh, but will hardly find more than one. Irish land presents a separate problem. Home Rulers deem themselves moderate in demanding the extension to all Ireland of the Ulster Tenant-right, which would reduce the landlord to the recipient of a rent charge. It may be doubted whether even that rent charge would not soon become the object of popular attack, for the peasant farmers seem bent upon getting rid of their landlords altogether. The consequences of Absenteeism are falling upon the first generation of Irish landlords that has made any attempt to do its duty; though the absentees are too numerous, even now. The great absentee of all has been the Sovereign, whose residence in Ireland for a part of the year during the last century, would have made a vast difference in the present temper of the people.

—Towards the Colonies the policy of the Liberals has always been the extension of self-government, the practical consummation of which, whether designed or not, must be nationality But we shall certainly see no step taken towards any change of political relations, much less any diminution of kindly feel-

ing or of interest. Jingoism, of course, in all forms will cease: there will be no more attempts to flunkeyize us, to inflame us with military ambition, or to use us for the purpose of aristocratic propagandism. Probably nothing more will be heard of an Imperial Zollverein; still less of Imperial Confederation, which would be a reversal of the Liberal Policy of extending self-government; though, for our part, we regret that the plan was not brought under the practical consideration of a Tory government for the final satisfaction of its advocates. There will be an end, too, so far as the Home Government is concerned, of all action, political or commercial, founded on the belief that the people of the United States are "a hostile, or at least an unfriendly, nation." It is the tradition of the Liberal party to regard and treat the Americans as a mighty branch of the Anglo-Saxon race, to view with sympathy, not with jealous hatred, the course of their great experiment in popular government, and to efface, if possible, the recollection of the Tory error which caused a parting, in itself inevitable, to assume the unhappy form of a revolution. We do not believe that the chance of obtaining substantial aid for the Pacific Railway will be diminished, because we do not believe that it was capable of diminution: nothing beyond a guarantee, which, we repeat, is a mere illusion, would have been granted, even if Lord Beaconsfield had remained in power. As to sympathy, instead of being stinted, it is likely to be poured forth in more abundant measure for the purpose of confuting the allegations of the Tories. In one respect the change of government has actually relieved the existing connection from danger. A Russian war would have made converts to Independence in a way that nobody desires, though the *Globe* the other day, for the purpose of contradicting somebody it disliked, undertook to prove that swift war steamers could not possibly do any mischief to fleets of merchantmen under sail.

Just as we go to press arrives the announcement that Mr. Gladstone is once more Prime Minister of England. He is the elect of the nation, and the people would have accepted no

other head. That his retirement from official life was unfeigned, and that he had no desire to be Premier again, is the belief of all who know him well. His feeling that he was free for ever from the responsibilities of office, and perfectly at liberty to act and speak like any other citizen, accounts for certain undiplomatic utterances, the effect of which it will take the tact and suavity of Lord Granville to remove. The bitterest enemy will not refuse to acknowledge, as creditable to the human physique, the energy which Mr. Gladstone has shown at seventy. Only the bitterest enemy will refuse to acknowledge that the nation has done honour to itself and to elective institutions by choosing a man in whom it undoubtedly believed that it saw the best representative of political morality, purity of aim, and sincere devotion to the public good. If the Court, by betraying its unwillingness to accept Mr. Gladstone, has brought upon itself something like humiliation, it may thank Lord Beaconsfield, who for many years has been instilling into it autocratic fancies, intoxicating it with slavish flattery, and encouraging it to display personal prepossessions and antipathies, the manifestation of which his English predecessors would have thought themselves bound by chivalrous sentiment as well as by their public duty as Ministers to repress.

—For Europe, as for England, the great event is the result of the English Elections. It is everywhere received with dismay by those who, whether in the interest of Reaction or in that of a Chauvinist Liberalism, desire war, or those combinations of great military powers, which, equally with war, give the ascendancy to force over right. It is as universally welcomed by those whose Liberalism means the progress of moral civilization. The military and naval forces of England will not be reduced; nor will she be less ready to defend herself or the rights of nations against real aggression, whether from the side of Russia or from any other side. But Lord Beaconsfield's taste for conspiracy will cease to govern her foreign as well as her domestic

policy. Lord Beaconsfield has been praised for having "restored to us a Europe." But what sort of a Europe did he restore? It was a Europe of five great military powers, from whose councils all the smaller nations were excluded, and who made their own interest the law of the world. Austria will mourn; Turkey will mourn: but all nations struggling for emancipation will rejoice. Power has passed from the hands of the man who was the bitter enemy of Italian, and is now the bitter enemy of Greek and Bulgarian, independence to the ardent friend of all.

—The French Government, having failed to carry through the Senate the Anti-Jesuit clause of its Education measure, seems resolved to put in force the dormant law against the Order. There is, of course, a cry of persecution. Persecution it would be, and a criminal inconsistency on the part of Liberals, if the object of the Jesuits were the inculcation of a religious faith, no matter how unpopular or superstitious. But the object of the Jesuits is, and always has been, not the inculcation of a religious faith, but intrigue. This is, and has always been, their object in education, as well as in other spheres. Because this was their object, and because their machinations were dangerous to civil society, they were suppressed in the last century at the instance, not of Protestants, but of the great Catholic powers. They aim at the subversion of all institutions founded on the principles of liberty and opposed to the despotism of the Pope. They, through their tool, the Empress, led France into the German war. Thirty-five years ago, they, by setting the Catholic cantons against the Protestant in Switzerland, brought on civil war there, and were sent over the frontier for their pains. The attempt to crush the liberties of Germany, which led to the Thirty Years' War, the attempt of James II. to crush the liberties of England, are historical monuments of a character and of designs which have never changed. Members of a cosmopolitan conspiracy against freedom, the Jesuits know no country, and banishment with them means merely a new field of

operations. Even by the national clergy of the Roman Catholic countries in which their operations have been carried on, they have always been viewed with jealousy and mistrust. The rule of Loyola is essentially immoral, since it demands of the neophyte the absolute surrender of his free-will and his conscience—that is, of his moral being—into the hands of his superior. Fortunately for the world, against which this spiritual militia was to be arrayed, you cannot deprive a man of his personality and make him "a living corpse" in the hands of any Old Man of the Mountain without, at the same time, depriving him of a good deal of his force. The work of the Jesuits, though artfully contrived and most patiently elaborated, has endured but for a night: discomforture has come with the morning. The age is now against them. The conclaves of despotism, the chief seats of their ascendancy, have given way to parliaments: king's confessors like king's mistresses are almost powers of the past. There remain, as objects and instruments of Jesuit influence, the suffrage in the hands of ignorance, women, and the School. Under the last Pope, who was a fanatic, the Jesuits were everything; they called the Vatican Council, they framed the Dogma of Infallibility. But the present Pope is more of an Italian statesman; he has managed to find a way of living practically at peace with Bismarck. Perhaps he will not be willing to put his Church in serious jeopardy for the sake of supporting the Jesuits in France.

That French Liberals and Liberals everywhere need a warning against dealing in a spirit of revolutionary violence with the beliefs and habits of the past may be readily admitted. They ought to lay to heart the lesson taught them by the reaction which followed the attempt suddenly to transform humanity made by the visionary leaders of their first Revolution. A change of institutions must fail unless the way is prepared for it by a change of opinion. It has been the error and the crime of the priests, when they had power in their hands, to do violence to conscience; and neither the error nor the crime would be the less if violence were done

to conscience by Liberal politicians. But the case of the Jesuits is exceptional, in the judgment of the more moderate among the Catholics themselves; and if the measure does not go beyond taking out of their hands the training of the future citizens of the Republic, the plea of political self-preservation will not have been greatly overstrained. Could the Jesuits, no matter by what means, kill the Republic, it would not live another hour.

—France has at last become the scene of a Female Suffrage movement, which appears, however, to make no progress. To the French the consequences of Female Government present themselves in too palpable a form. They would be, without doubt, the restoration of the Empire, or of the Bourbon Monarchy, priestly ascendancy, and a crusade against German Protestantism or Italian Independence in the interest of the Pope. But would the men obey? Would they, in compliance with a vote of the women, pull down the political edifice cemented with so much blood, and shoulder their muskets for a war against their own convictions? Assuredly they would not: and where would be the use of setting up a government obedience to which would be immediately refused?

—The erudition and diligence of Mr. Alpheus Todd are well known; and his new work on "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies" appears to be a valuable repertory of the lore of which he is probably the greatest master. He is always a constitutional optimist. If it were not disrespectful, we should be disposed to say that in him, as in other esteemed writers of the same class, there was a good deal of constitutional buckram. "Elevated above the blinding influences of party, and intent only upon promoting the public good, the sovereign never ceases to influence, by opinion or suggestion, the direction of the State. And to this end he is free to avail himself of all the opportunities afforded by his exalted station and eminent ad-

vantages. By suggestion or remonstrance, by impartial advice, and by enlightened criticism, proceeding from a mind that should be richly stored with knowledge and experience upon all affairs of State, or questions of public policy, that might at any time demand consideration or settlement, the influence of the monarch may be legitimately exercised and expressed." This is the ideal as presented to our reverence by a constitutional master of the ceremonies: what is the reality? "I try and take him to pieces," says Thackeray of George IV, "and find silk stockings, padding, stays, a coat with frogs and a fur collar, a star and blue ribbon, a pocket handkerchief prodigiously scented, one of Truefit's best nutty-brown wigs reeking with oil, a set of teeth, and a huge black stock, under-waistcoats, more under-waistcoats and then nothing."

It is not seldom the fate of the Constitutional hierophant while he is in accordance with law to be at variance with history. We are enjoined to discard, as a fundamental error, the belief that in England the power of the Crown to reject laws has ceased to exist. Fundamental the error may be, but at all events it is pardonable, seeing that the prerogative has not been really exercised since the time of William III.

A careful and perfectly judicial review of the Letellier case brings Mr. Todd to the conclusion "that the action taken for the removal of Lieut.-Governor Letellier was at variance with constitutional law and precedent as well as contrary to the spirit and intent of the British North America Act; inasmuch as it was initiated by Parliament and not by the executive government, and did not set forth the particular acts of misconduct for which his removal was deemed to be necessary." Here again we cannot help thinking that the learned writer is, in some measure, the victim of constitutional buckram. The executive government, according to the formal theory, is, no doubt, a body of servants of the Crown, appointed by Her Majesty or her representative, and perfectly separate from the legislature: but in fact it is a committee of the party which has the majority in Parliament; and the distinction, which to Mr. Todd seems so

essential, practically comes almost to nothing. Party, under our present system, is the real force; it will practically decide all questions of government, let the forms be what they may. Mr. Todd also, we venture to think, in this and other places assumes that there are settled rules and precedents when in fact there are none. The Federal portion of our constitution is new and peculiar; nothing in the British Constitution corresponds to it, nor can questions arising out of it be determined by British principles or precedents. According to Mr. Todd himself, the British authorities on this occasion went entirely wrong: it is possible that they may have been but half satisfied with their own decision; but they knew that the dominant party in the colony must have its way.

In the affair of the Pacific Scandal, Mr. Todd pronounces that Lord Dufferin, to whom his book is dedicated, displayed an almost adorable knowledge of constitutional principles by following throughout the advice of his ministers. That on all questions of policy the Crown should be so guided, is, as we know, the principle of Constitutional Government. But this was not a question of policy: it was a personal charge of corruption; in England it would have assumed the form of a motion of impeachment, and, supposing that motion to be carried, a trial before the House of Lords. To contend that it was right that the persons accused should be allowed to advise the Crown as to the conduct of the investigation; to use the prerogative for the purpose of proroguing Parliament when it had entered on the case, and thus gaining time for the exertion of party interest in their own favour; to transfer the inquiry to another tribunal of their own appointment; and when Parliament had reassembled, to bring down despatches of the Governor-General with a view to influencing the decision; seems to us, with all deference to Mr. Todd's authority, to be at variance with due common sense. The controversy has become absolutely nauseous; the people at the last general election, without changing their minds about it, wisely refused to allow it any more to interfere with present interests, and we refer to it with the greatest re-

luctance. But confident we are that, by uncourtly history, while allowance will be made for ministers struggling for their political lives, the conduct of the Governor-General, in this matter, instead of being glorified, will be condemned. That after a party struggle, carried on in the most unjudicial manner, and with the most objectionable weapons on both sides, the ministry fell, is a fact which does not seem to us to alter the case. Mr. Todd talks rather mysteriously of some "reserved powers" which Lord Dufferin was prepared, in the last resort, to use. Does he mean that, if Parliament had sustained the ministers, Lord Dufferin would, by his personal authority, have turned them out and dissolved Parliament? If he does, how would such a course have squared with his theories of the Constitution? If he does not mean this, what does he mean? What other "reserved power" could there be?

Mr. Todd does not tell us whether, under our Constitution, we have any mode of bringing political offenders to justice by a judicial process analogous to the British process of impeachment. It is high time that there should be a tribunal of some kind; and that, in such cases, the interest and honour of the nation should no longer be left to the chances of a party fray, which is as likely to be decided by bribery as by anything else. Corruption is our greatest political danger; amidst this vast expenditure on public works it is growing, as it could not fail to do; it is an offence at once most heinous, and perfectly capable of judicial treatment, if a proper court and mode of procedure were provided. Once more we commend the subject to the consideration of the guardians of our public morality, and especially to that of Mr. Blake.

When Mr. Todd speaks of the office of the Governor-General, his tone is one of almost religious awe. He gravely rebukes those persons who, not having thought profoundly on the subject, are under the heretical impression that the chief duties of the Governor-General are to perform ceremonies, make speeches, and give dinners "to whoever may be a suitable recipient of vice-regal favour"—that phrase being, we presume, a delicate allusion

to certain grounds of unsuitableness which formed matter for profane mirth. But, says Mr. Todd, "without underrating for a moment the incalculable advantages which society and the State derive from the fulfilment of the duties above enumerated, by men in exalted positions—assisted by the ladies of their household—such ceremonial observances and festivities might, without much loss of dignity or efficiency, be assigned to cabinet ministers and other prominent officers of government, of adequate rank and fortune." It follows that to justify the continuance of an expensive office, the Governor-General must have some political functions of an important kind. What those functions are—why the Government of Canada cannot walk alone—we leave the curious to learn from Mr. Todd's own pages, the meaning of which, we fear, might evaporate if we ventured on condensation.

The writer evidently feels that he is suspended by the Governor-Generalship over the abyss of democracy, into which, if that golden cord cracked, he would at once fall. We will tell him a story which has always seemed to us full of comfort. There was in the Isle of Wight an exciseman who had been laudably active in the performance of his duty. One night smugglers seized him, blindfolded him, carried him to what they told him was the edge of a cliff, suspended him over it with a rope in his hands, and told him to hold on as long as he could. He held on till his sinews cracked, then committing his soul to Heaven, he let go, and found that he had been hanging six inches from the ground.

"It is true," says Mr. Todd, "that the governor of a colony is not a viceroy." It is to be presumed, therefore, that he does not possess the delegated power of touching for the King's Evil. Of late, however, a tendency to turn him into a viceroy has been visible in this colony. Lord Lisgar was simply a governor; he was content with performing the regular duties of his office, and making himself useful in an unostentatious manner, by giving his ministers the benefit of his long experience, and smoothing matters a little behind the scenes. He never

went on the stump, or put himself personally forward in any way. His household and his entertainments were those of an English gentleman, and were useful as an example of hospitality combined with simplicity and good taste. But with his successor came a change. Lord Dufferin wished personally to make his mark, and to set forward his own fortunes, as well as to put into practice the policy which the rise of Jingoism was then bringing into vogue. "No sooner had their Excellencies landed in Quebec, than a series of receptions, levées, dinner parties, balls, and visits to public institutions, educational, religious, and charitable, were inaugurated, which revived in the glorious old city the departed grandeur of the ancient régime." Such are the rapturous words of a historiographer whose work we believe has no parallel in literature except the "Lord Mayor's Visit to Oxford," which the eccentric Lord Dudley had bound in ass's skin with an appropriate inscription, and in which the horses of the Lord Mayor's carriage are represented as proudly pawing in the consciousness of their august burden. Under this system of profuse hospitality, we are particularly told, lay a profound policy: in other words, it was not hospitality, but a polite way of purchasing the adhesion of those who are to be influenced by such means. It was carried to such an extent that, at last, in the midst of a commercial depression, people were selling their furniture to buy dresses for a fancy ball; and this in a country where the thing specially wanted was an example of hospitality and sociability without ostentation or extravagance. At the same time, the character of the office underwent a corresponding change: it was turned into a sort of democratic monarchy, the monarch being raised on high, while all his lieges were placed on the same level below, an arrangement which did not entirely please some of those who were "levelled down." Receptions became "drawing-rooms" and "levées"; the terms "viceroyalty" and "viceregal" were perpetually used; and the ministers were desired to don the Windsor uniform, though some we believe rebelled. The expenses

of the place were greatly increased—at a time of financial embarrassment $17,000 were spent on a single vice-regal excursion—and the fashion was introduced of organizing receptions on a lavish scale, which bore heavily on the less wealthy Provinces. The Tower of Siloam is always falling on the wrong heads; a motion is now brought forward in Parliament about the Governor-General's expenditure; but the present holder of the office, though he found his bed made for him, has personally been inclined to simplicity and moderation.

The attempt to introduce etiquette emanated, we may be sure, from the head-quarters of Jingoism. Mr. Todd would probably admit that it has failed, after furnishing materials for a chapter in our social history. The last order of the Lord Chamberlain in England, is that every lady shall appear at Court with three ostrich feathers stuck upright in her hair—positively in her hair, and not in any other structure—the consequence of which, we are told, is an increased demand for false hair. The order will probably not extend to Canada. Wherever there is vulgarity there is flunkeyism, and whatever there is of these elements in Canada has been stirred up from the very dregs; but the London *Times* does us injustice in supposing that these absurdities were welcomed with delight by the majority of a sensible and self-respecting people.

—Mr. Davin, the other day, gave us a book on "The Irishman in Canada," which received and deserved applause. Mr. Rattray now gives us a book on "The Scot in British North America," which deserves applause, and will no doubt receive it; since it appeals not merely to the patriotism of the Scot, but to the taste of all lovers of good writing. The historic muse of Canada, at all events, can produce something better than "hog's-wash;" and Mr. Rattray, if not a Canadian by birth, is the distinguished son of a Canadian *Alma Mater*. The Irishman in Canada, the Scot in Canada, the Frenchman in Canada, the United Empire Loyalist in Canada, all these have or are to

have their histories. The German in Canada, the Welshman in Canada, perhaps the Orangeman, the Free Mason, the Odd Fellow in Canada, will be added to the list in time. But the Canadian, when will he find an annalist? Who can fail to be struck by the feebleness of the assimilating forces here, compared with those on the other side of the line: there everything goes into the hopper and is speedily ground down into Yankee; here not only does the French mass set all solvents at defiance and rather harden itself in its isolation, but even a fragment of Germany retains its separate character and language. Mr. Sullivan has given us a National Anthem, in length at all events worthy of the greatness that is to be: but where, Mr. Sullivan, is the nation?

In the volume of his work at present published, Mr. Rattray is concerned with the history of Scotland itself, and the influences that have formed the Scotch character. The second topic is one upon which Mr. Buckle went far astray. He confounded the Highlands with the Lowlands, and traced the religious peculiarities of the Lowland Presbyterians to the effects produced upon the minds of the people by the awful scenery and terrific storms of the Highlands. It was a blunder as gross as that of George IV., who, to please the people of Edinburgh, arrayed himself in what he took for the Highland dress, and gave as a toast "The Scottish Chieftains with their clans, and the Land of Cakes." Equally erroneous was the parallel which Mr. Buckle drew between Scotland as a land of bigotry, and Spain: the main source of Spanish bigotry was the long conflict with the Moors, as Russian bigotry is in some measure the offspring of the long conflict with the Tartars. It was Mr. Buckle's fancy to explain all moral phenomena by physical causes, and his ascription of Spanish peculiarities to volcanoes and earthquakes is as devoid of foundation as his ascription of Scotch peculiarities to the meteorology of the Highlands. The basis of the Scotch character is precisely the same as that of the English: the Lowlands are Saxon settlements accidentally cut off from the rest, and subsequently feudalized by Norman im-

migrants. Of what is peculiar to the Scotch the main factors are the niggard soil, which, as Mr. Rattray sees, compelled labour, enforced frugality, and in the end stimulated emigration; and, still more, the peculiar form taken by the Scottish Reformation. Where the Kings were the Reformers, Episcopacy was retained as the form of Church government most congenial to monarchy in the State: it was retained by Gustavus Vasa, in the Lutheran Church of Sweden, as well as by the Tudors in the Semi-Catholic Church of England. But in Scotland at the critical moment the monarchy was practically in abeyance: the people made the Reformation; and the National Church took a popular form. Its struggles thenceforth constitute the main interest of Scottish history, and it long furnished the people with a school of self-government more effective than any supplied by their political institutions. During the Middle Ages the development of a real parliament was prevented by feudal anarchy and by the absence of an opulent middle class; while at a later period Scotland, through the untoward state of the suffrage, became one vast rotten borough, and obtained a free representation only in 1832. The leaders of the nation were preachers such as Knox, Melville, and Henderson; the politics were Church politics; the rising against Charles I. and the revolutionary government which conducted it took an ecclesiastical form. That for which the Scotch drew the sword was not political reform but the Covenant, which they strove to force as the price of their alliance on the English, whose leaders, as political Liberals, used all their diplomatic skill to obtain Presbyterian aid in the war yet keep their free necks out of the Presbyterian yoke.

The same circumstances explain the curious union in the Scotch character of mental freedom and enlightenment, up to a certain point, with extreme and even persecuting intolerance beyond. On the one hand Scotland was swept clear of priesthood and priestly authority; the creed and worship were thoroughly purged of mediæval superstitions; the Bible was really opened; and that all might be able to read it education was provided, as a religious duty, for the people. On the other hand, the people

themselves became a sort of clergy, as passionately devoted as any priests to the maintenance of the doctrinal system and the Church government which they had themselves set up, and for which they had fought so hard and endured so many trials. The circumstances of their history made them a race of dogmatic theologians; while the antagonism of the laity to the clergy, which, in priestly countries, was a powerful element in the process of emancipation, in Scotland had no existence. The dogma of Predestination no doubt added something of rigidity to the Presbyterian character as well as a sombre hue. Hence the execution of a youth for heterodoxy at Edinburgh in the ages of Tillotson, Locke, and Newton: the backwardness, till quite recently, of Science in Scotland; the ejection from the Scotch ministry of such men as Mr. Macleod Campbell, the author of the best work that Pietism has ever produced on the Atonement; the scandalous prosecutions of good and learned men for their opinions, which are still going on in Scotland; the tyrannical narrowness which Scotchmen are apt to carry into politics, and the noxious effects of which in Canada Mr. Rattray will have to point out, if, as we hope, he means his work to be not a panegyric but a history. Every national character has its bad as well as its good side. Scotch intolerance is as much a fact as Scotch worth: just as Scotch enterprise of the nobler kind has its evil shadow in the "booing Scot" who never stood upright in the presence of a great man.'

—Mr. Ingersoll has lectured, and probably all persons of sense will now agree that to prevent him, or try to prevent him, would have been a great mistake. Even the refusal of his advertisements by some of our contemporaries did mischief, and exposed them, as usual, to the telling charge of excluding from their advertising columns heterodoxy while they admitted worse things. Mr. Ingersoll draws as a declaimer in favour of mental liberty: let mental liberty be entire and his declamation will lose its point. He will then be compelled

to take up the subject of morality, which he at present neglects, and to present to his audiences a rule of life higher and purer than that of the Gospel. We should see how he would fare in that attempt, and what meed of applause he would receive from those who now cheer him for thus tickling their irreverence with a delight more nearly akin to that which is produced by tickling indecency than they would care to acknowledge. The efficacy of a new moral creed is first shown in elevating the character of its apostles. The characters of Voltaire and Rousseau, setting religion aside, were not satisfactory: Voltaire was untruthful and unclean, while the vices of Rousseau are frankly recorded in his "Confessions." Even in the demeanour of the preacher, and in his mode of propagating his faith, the value of the faith itself is seen. The Christian Apostles taught with simplicity and earnestness, and without a price, the doctrines which, as no one but the most fanatical of atheists would deny, made a revolution not less beneficent than immense in the moral world. The trade of a sensational lecturer is as adverse as anything that can be imagined to the single-minded and conscientious pursuit of truth. As carried on by Mr. Ingersoll, it is equally adverse to the dissemination of truth when attained. Instead of winning disciples, as the Christian teachers have done, by gentleness and sympathy, he repels those whose convictions he outrages. He repels all decent men, whatever their convictions; for no decent man likes blasphemy any more than he likes obscenity. The tastes, we repeat, are nearly akin. We say this with as thorough-going a respect for free inquiry, and as hearty a conviction that it is the only possible road out of our perplexities as it is possible for any Agnostic to entertain. Mr. Ingersoll himself, if he has swept his mind clear of all belief, cannot be guilty of blasphemy; but he ought to recollect that many of his audience can, and that in them it is degrading, and destructive of a genuine love of truth.

In his lecture on "The Gods," Mr. Ingersoll appears to have used an argument which is much in vogue, and has produced a good deal of effect. Man's idea of God rises with his progress

in civilization. Hence it is inferred that God is merely a human idea. But a child's notion of its parents grows higher with the growth of its mind, and it does not hence follow that its parents are merely the creatures of its imagination. We do not wish to press the analogy too far, but it proves, at all events, that a conception need not be stationary to be founded in reality. Progress, and progress by effort, or at least by activity, appears to be the general law of our being; it is the law of affection among the rest; the feeling grows higher as those who feel grow worthier, and their intercourse is increased: it may be so with our religious affection as well as with our affection for each other. Assuming that there is a God, this revelation of Himself to man may be through human nature, and if it is through human nature, it must be gradual and progressive. Moreover, when advance in civilization is spoken of, the question arises whether religion is not itself the basis of civilization and the mainspring of advancement in it. In the past, at all events, the great systems of civilization, or what is much the same thing, of morality, have appeared in a religious form. So far, instead of saying that man has made the conception of God, it would be more correct to say that the conception of God has made man. If this conception flows from no reality, from what does it flow? It is a phenomenon of which, as of other phenomena, there must be some explanation; and we have not yet chanced to see in the writings of any Agnostic an explanation which seemed at all satisfactory. Religion cannot have been the invention of priests, for the obvious reason that there could have been no priests without religion. There is ground at least for hesitation, and insolence as yet is out of place.

On the other hand let the guardians of religion note the popularity of Mr. Ingersoll, who had large audiences on both his nights. It is a warning to set the Church in order. Religion is carrying a weight which it cannot bear. The tribal, primæval, and oriental morality of the Old Testament is not fit now to be presented as a revelation of the Divine character and a rule of life to congregations too unlearned to under-

stand the stages through which the education of humanity has necessarily passed. Things which in the light of Science and Criticism can no longer be taken as literally true, ought no longer to be tendered for belief. Alexandrian or Mediæval dogma, such as the startling paradoxes of the creed miscalled Athanasian, ought not to be confounded with the truth that made the world free. The work of expurgation is very difficult, but unless the credible can be separated from the incredible, the reasonable from that which shocks reason, there will be a total eclipse of faith. Mr. Ingersoll is in the right only when he attacks dogmatic orthodoxy; but when he attacks dogmatic orthodoxy he is in the right, and the people cannot be prevented from seeing it, exclude him from your advertising columns and your lecture halls as you may.

On one dogma especially his hits tell with fatal force—that of Eternal Torture,—for doubting which, or hinting that doubt was possible, an eminent preacher of Toronto was not long ago in danger of being cast out of the ministry. Into the exegetical controversy we of course do not pretend to enter: we will only remark that verbal criticism in the interpretation of Christ's sayings is generally of little value, since the words which are recorded in Greek, and only after a considerable interval of time, were originally uttered in Aramaic. But belief in the dogma of Eternal Torture (we speak with all possible deference for the feelings of those who suppose themselves bound to uphold it) is incompatible with a moral conception of the nature of the Deity; and when it is combined with Predestination, its reception can be explained only by the facility with which people will go on repeating a traditional creed, and even arguing metaphysically in support of it, without realizing its moral import. Edwards, who is the great metaphysical reasoner in support of this doctrine, manifestly recoils from his own moral conclusions. He may well do so; and the stone which his unbeneficent genius has helped to tie round the neck of Christianity must be cast off, or it will sink the religion.

In these times, the position of the clergy is a most trying one. Turned as their thoughts constantly are to these questions, and with the knowledge which they professionally possess, it is impossible that their minds should be free from the general disquietude. Ever and anon, indeed, a secession betrays the conflict which has been going on and which, we may be sure, is not confined to the breasts of the seceders. Some of these men, perhaps, have gone into the ministry as men have gone into other professions, for a piece of bread, but most of them may fairly be supposed to have chosen their calling as the most spiritual, and thus to be peculiarly sensitive to the prick of conscience. The taunt of hypocrisy, flung against them by writers and declaimers of an extreme school, is uncharitable as well as discourteous. If, in despite of growing doubt, they cling to the formularies to which they have subscribed—which many of them subscribed before serious doubt had arisen—it may fairly be assumed that they are moved as much by the fear of a general catastrophe as by that of losing their own subsistence. Their best justification and comfort in adhering to an equivocal position will perhaps be found in the fact illustrated in our last number, that scepticism is unable to devise any code of Ethics better than a rationalized Christianity. But those who have any misgivings ought at least to promote, to the utmost of their power, the extension of mental freedom. Perhaps the day may be not far distant when we shall see how alien it is to the spirit of the Gospel, as well as to reason, to impose tests on any one, above all on those who are specially dedicated to the service of Truth.

THE BYSTANDER.

JUNE, 1880.

THE close of the session at Ottawa was marked by an incident equal in importance to the debate on the Pacific Railway, and not unconnected with that question. Mr. Mackenzie announced his resignation of the leadership of the Opposition, and Mr. Blake was at once installed in the vacant place. When last Mr. Blake stepped forwards, in response to a call from the country even clearer and louder than the present, he saw a giant armed in the path, and turned aside. This time, though the same form seemed to bar the way, he did not turn aside; and the huge scarecrow at once came crashing and lumbering to the ground, with all its seeming bulk of lath and its swelling spread of sheet, with all its rag-market and tin-shop accoutrements of terror. Never again, we may hope, will it frighten a Canadian statesman from his duty to his cause, his friends, and himself. A journal ably conducted and just, or anything like just, in its criticisms will have its share of influence; but newspaper tyranny can be exercised only over a nation miserably prone to servitude; and Canada will be inexcusable if, having seen such a despotism laid flat in the mire by a slight exertion of courage, she again bows to the ignominious domination. From the very manner in which the *Globe* made its attacks on Mr. Blake, not directly, but obliquely, by stabbing at him through another person, he might have learned that there was nothing insuperable in front of him; and a single straight blow from his arm would have cleared the road long since. Better late than never; but

better soon than late. Had Mr. Blake held his own six years ago, his party would not have desperately committed itself to the Pacific Railway, nor would it have forfeited power by placing itself in pedantic and stiff-necked opposition to the just claims of Canadian industry.

Mr. Mackenzie retired with simplicity and dignity. It is of course the duty of the Ministerial press to make a little mischief, if possible, in the other camp by representing him as an ill-used man and his removal from the leadership as a grand error; though their own fyles, if anyone cared to explore those treasures, would furnish abundant proof that, according to their estimate of his character, the only error committed was in not sending him to the Penitentiary. There is no occasion for drawing invidious comparisons between him and his successor. It is enough to say that the influence which supported one had gained strength, while that which supported the other had declined. Gritism had no meaning; it kindled no enthusiasm; it afforded no rallying point; it formed no ground of opposition to the Ministerial policy from which, in fact, it differed not at all on the main question. It was Whiggery in Canada, without the great houses which alone give Whiggery its vitality in England. Liberalism has a meaning, and it does furnish a ground of opposition, provided that its leaders will address themselves not to changes of electoral machinery, about which nobody at present cares, but to the great and pressing question of the day.

—The great and pressing question of the day is that of commercial relations and of public works in connection with them. There are two policies, either of which a statesman may take without forfeiting that title, but between which every statesman is called upon to choose, and which may be called the Continental and the Anti-Continental. The Anti-Continental policy is that of the present government. It is the commercial corollary of Jingoism. Its cardinal principle, frankly enunciated the other day by its ambassador to England, is that the people of

the United States are to be viewed and treated commercially as "a hostile or, at least, an unfriendly people," and that Canada is to be cut off as much as possible from the continent inhabited by them and to which she geographically belongs. It is the policy of a party here identical with the Tory party in England, and endeavouring, in the interest of Toryism, to create a power antagonistic to democracy on this continent. It regards Canada not as a community of the New World with interests and a future of her own, but as an "auxiliary kingdom" to be governed by a quasi-aristocracy of Knights. In commerce, as in everything else, it shuns the contagion of the Republic. Its instruments are the political railroads destined to weld together Provinces widely separated by nature, and to prevent their inhabitants from using the natural routes, which lie through American territory; a sharp customs line severing Canada from American markets; commercial treaties to connect her with other parts of the globe; and, if possible, an Imperial Zollverein. Its adherents contemplate, not with unmixed horror, an actual war with the United States, and advocate the diversion of roads from the line of trade, as well as the increase of military expenditure, with that view. Setting aside any question as to the general object, which is a matter of opinion, this policy is proving itself to be economically impracticable. It condemns Canada to a commercial atrophy, the inevitable effect of severance from her own continent, and commits her to an expenditure on Public Works which, especially when suffering from that atrophy, she is wholly unable to bear. The first of the political railways, the Intercolonial, has proved financially a ruinous failure, and will become even more worthless and a greater burden than it is as soon as the natural route is opened through Maine. The second road, that to the North of Lake Superior, has been virtually abandoned in favour of the natural route through American territory; so that we are in the absurd position of lavishing great sums on the distant links of a chain, while the nearest link is wanting. The commercial treaties, like the trade in

clothing with the Antipodes, which was to yield such golden returns, have come to nothing; and as to the Imperial Zollverein, nobody who knows the state of opinion in England and the necessities of British industry, could regard such a project as anything but a dream. A debt has been piled up, as great in proportion to our resources as that of the United States, though we have had no civil war, and it is still increasing, while that of the United States is being reduced. Sir Francis Hincks, a strong Imperialist, and an advocate of the Pacific Railway, proclaims that the country is "drifting into bankruptcy," and that a terrible reckoning day is at hand. Commercial Imperialism is, in fact, cutting its throat, like a pig as it swims; for the outlay on political railroads, causing an excess of expenditure over revenue, entails an increase of taxes which involves the imposition of higher duties on British goods. The end, probably, will be a more complete and signal suicide; for financial disaster can hardly fail to bring with it compulsory annexation. In making us "one from sea to sea," the Anti-Continental Policy will also make us one from Mexico to the Pole.

The Continental policy, on the other hand, is akin to the political spirit which has just triumphed over Jingoism in England. It accepts for Canada the position of a community of the New World, though bound by the strongest tie of affection to her parent in the Old World, and refuses to sacrifice the interest of her people in any way to that of the European Reaction. It regards the American Republic not as an object of everlasting hostility, but as a friend and neighbour. It welcomes partnership with her in all the commercial advantages of this Continent, and in the construction and use of its necessary highways. It abjures the idea of wasting the substance of the Canadian people in works otherwise unnecessary and unremunerative, for the purpose of forcing commerce out of her natural routes, in order to save her from political contagion. It cherishes a sound financial position as the only real guarantee for general independence. A war with the United States it refuses to contemplate as a ground for denying to Canada great

advantages or imposing on her heavy burdens. Let the Knights say what they will; let conventional opinion applaud the Anti-American eloquence of Governor-Generals on the stump as loudly as it may, there is evidently nothing in the Continental policy repugnant to any strong or deeply-seated sentiments in the breasts of the commercial classes, or in those of the people. No Canadian man of business ever refuses dealings with Americans which he thinks will be profitable to himself. Canadian banks have their branches and loan tens of millions in the United States. The management and ownership of the railway system is coming daily to be more in common. When the road from the Maritime Provinces to Quebec through Maine is opened, it will be seen that shippers and passengers are not disposed to describe a vast curve to the northwards for the purpose of maintaining a military line, or of avoiding temporary contact with a nation which has no Knights. As to the people, they show their intense hatred of Republicanism, and their readiness to sacrifice their material interests to its extinction, by migrating into its domain whenever they have the slightest material inducement to do so. They are now flocking to the States by thousands: four thousand went from one Province in April. Even such of them as are farmers go in greater numbers to Minnesota and Dacota than to the territories which we are spending so many millions to incorporate. While all this money is being squandered, and all these risks are being incurred for the purpose of securing perfect and everlasting separation, the people of the two countries are quietly blending with each other, and if we may believe the current statements, a sixth of the Canadian nation is already on the south of the line.

—Blame can hardly be cast on the Government for pursuing a course which Imperialists must believe to be the best. Certainly the Opposition cannot throw stones at them. For the Opposition itself, when in office under its last leader, committed itself to the Pacific Railway undertaking in its whole extent,

and, at the same time, to the policy to which that undertaking belonged. It even gave a heavy pledge to Militarism by founding the Kingston College. Its present leader has dallied with Imperial Federation, which implies, together with a retrocession of self-government, contribution to Imperial armaments, and full participation in Imperial wars. For ourselves, we unfeignedly deplore the necessity of an appeal to party at all, and look forward with earnest hope to the day when, instead of calling upon one set of statesmen to oppose and thwart another set as antagonists and rivals, we may be able to call upon them all to combine their councils and do what to their united wisdom appears best for the country. We say this with special emphasis on the present occasion, when the nation has been brought into peril by an enterprise for which all our public men are more or less responsible, and for their connection with which all of them may plead the excuse of a general illusion, the offspring of intoxicating prosperity, and of the haze of exaggeration with which the flattering rhetoric of official seekers after popularity had enveloped our affairs. But for the present the party system is established; we must take it as it is, and look to the Opposition under its new leadership to check the Government, which is not only itself bent on pursuing its perilous course, but beset, we may be sure, by a band of contractors and contract-mongers, such as these great public works always call into being, eager for the prosecution of an enterprise which promises immense private gains. The Grit organ itself is hardly louder in denouncing the prudence which would check the enterprise than it is in proclaiming the corruption which attends it; as though corruption were not an inherent part of all large government undertakings of this kind. It would not be surprising if some scandalous revelation were to give the Opposition a handle which they might use without having to make any awkward reference to the history of their own proceedings in a previous state of existence.

—We are drifting into bankruptcy; the reckoning day is near; and the main cause of this is rash expenditure on public works—so said the Montreal *Journal of Commerce*, yet now it applauds the decision of the House of Commons to go on with the railway in British Columbia, a railway "beginning nowhere and leading to nothing," cut off from us and all our interests by a thousand miles of territory and the Rocky Mountains, the traffic of which is to be drawn from a section of a country the whole of which contains less than fifteen thousand inhabitants, and, if we may trust a high authority, no more good farm land than there is in an Ontario County. The writer says so much about the lack of Imperialism in those who side with Mr. Blake that he may be fairly supposed to be not without political designs; but the argument which he puts forward is the faith of Canada plighted to the people of British Columbia, by which he maintains that we are absolutely bound. "It would be impossible," he says, "that any contract could be entered into in a more solemn and formal manner than the one in question." This, perhaps, is a little high-pitched: as in the case of Confederation, so in the case of the more than reckless treaty with British Columbia, the politicians took it upon themselves to deal with a question morally beyond the scope of their mandate, though legally no doubt within its scope, without ascertaining the opinion of the people. Their object was not doubtful: it was purely political, and they beguiled the people by an illusory clause in the contract providing that the railway should be built without an increase of taxation. It is not pretended that when they made that treaty they had properly surveyed the route of the promised road, or formed any definite estimate of the expenditure to which they were pledging their unfortunate clients. Solemn, therefore, the compact is not; but it is a compact, and one by which we presume our representatives, greatly as they misused their powers, were legally competent to bind us. Those who have a taste for casuistry might perhaps raise the question how far the right of the British Columbians to ruin the Confederation by the execution

of an agreement made before they were members of it is modified by their duty to preserve it since they have become members. But fortunately British Columbia has herself indicated, over and over again, the proper mode of escaping from the dilemma. She has over and over again offered us our choice between the fulfilment of the compact and separation. What one party to the compact has offered the other without breach of honour may accept. The proper course is, by restoring to British Columbia her independence, to liberate her and Canada from an engagement ruinous to them both. There is nothing to prevent British Columbia from again entering the Confederation if she thinks fit to do so on terms consistent with its solvency, and not subversive of its existence. In the *Journal of Commerce* we find high language about the integrity of the Dominion. Let the national bankruptcy, which the *Journal of Commerce* declares to be close at hand, arrive, and what will become of the integrity of the Dominion? When the surplus of Ontario is exhausted, and she begins to feel the constant drain on her, a heavy strain will be laid on the bond which unites her with the drainers. Only in a formal sense would the integrity of the Dominion be impaired by the secession of British Columbia. She has been annexed, but she has not been incorporated, nor made morally a part of the Confederation. She neither cares nor affects to care much for the Federal interest; not a syllable of consideration for the difficulties and dangers of the Dominion has she uttered; money for herself is all her cry. She does not seem to want the road as a bond of union: that so many millions shall be spent within her territory is the one thing on which she insists. Let the *Journal of Commerce* talk about the value of the British Columbian vote to the party in power, and we shall know what it means.

Once more, we would exhort those who wish to form a rational opinion on these questions to look, not only at the political, but at the physical and economical map. They will see that the four regions which we are trying, at a boundless cost, to weld into one—the Maritime Provinces, Old Canada, the

North-West and British Columbia—are not really coterminous, nor capable of unification, apart from the adjoining Continent. The natural routes between them, which commerce must and will take, lie through American territory, and each of them is cemented by commercial interest to the States immediately to the south of it; Ontario herself being indissolubly connected with the region from which she draws her coal. There neither is, nor is likely to be, any access to Manitoba or the provinces of the Dominion beyond, except through the territory and by the sufferance of that very power against whose supposed enmity the whole scheme is directed. Upon this project, inspired by aristocratic ambition, of dividing a Continent dedicated to industry into two hostile sections, and reproducing here the international jealousies, the militarism and the wars of the Old World, nature has laid her ban, which will not be removed though we may be ruined in desperately struggling to remove it.

—A flourishing report has been given by the Government of the state and prospects of the North-West. We receive it without any misgiving as to its integrity, but with the circumspection requisite in the case of sanguine statements made in support of the policy to which a Government is committed, and by which it must stand or fall. The policy was adopted before the country had been explored, before it was known whether it contained available coal, without which, the supply of wood in it being very scanty, it could not have been inhabited at all. No doubt, the territory, being just opened and having been immensely advertised, there will be a rush into it this year: whether this rush will continue, time will be required to show, as it will to show whether the sale of the lands will pay for the construction of the road, for running it when first opened, and for the administration of the territory, which is costing a round sum. It is to be remembered that we have to compete in the sale of lands with the Americans, who are sure

not to let us carry off the emigration, if they can help it. It is also to be remembered that to open up that vast country, it will be necessary to construct, not one railroad, but twenty, in the lines marked out, not by politics, but by commerce; and that the public lands will have to pay, in part at least, for all of these, not for the political railway alone. A perfectly impartial report, with a calm forecast of probabilities, would be invaluable, if any one could be found to write it. People evidently see things with different eyes. "I have read," says Bishop Taché,* "glowing reports from the Plains; they brought out all the advantages; they particularly described the quantity of wood. But, book in hand, I saw the country described, and asked myself, Who is the dreamer—the author or the reader?" The hope of a great addition to the public revenue from the North-West seems baseless: a country much larger than Canada herself, and accessible only through foreign territory, cannot be kept permanently under fiscal control. Many Canadian farmers will no doubt settle in the North-West, among a still larger number of settlers from other countries, and by their departure, and the competition of Manitoban wheat with ours, farm property will be depreciated, and has already begun to be depreciated in the old Provinces. This to Canada is likely to be the chief return for what she may spend on the North-West.

Of course, we do not forget that there is alleged to be not only a Canadian and an Imperial, but a European, object, for the present enterprise. It is said that the Canadian Pacific is needed as a short road for traffic between Europe and the East. If it is, Europe will construct it without cost or peril to Canada. The trade of Canada with the East will never be so large as to make it worth her while to construct a railway across the continent at her own expense, rather than let it come over the American line.

---

* Quoted by Mr. Alexander Monro, in his work on 'The United States and the Dominion of Canada.' Mr. Monro, having, as a land surveyor, traversed large portions of the Dominion during the last fifty years, is well qualified to treat practically a subject which has generally received only rhetorical treatment.

The time may not be very far distant when people will begin to think that there was more sense than treason in the proposal to be content with Old Canada, a modest yet noble heritage, to crown the edifice of self-government there, and, while we retained our tie of affection to the Mother Country, to regulate our commercial relations in the interest of our own people. But regret is vain: the opportunity has been lost.

—By the debate on the payment of the salary to Sir Alexander Galt a veil was raised, and the veracity of Sir John Macdonald was vindicated. Sir John had proclaimed his visit to England a success, yet he seemed to have accomplished nothing. We now see that a scheme was agreed upon between him and Lord Beaconsfield, the execution of which was deferred till victory in the elections should have renewed Lord Beaconsfield's lease of power. It would not have done, before the elections, to add anything in the way of Colonial expenditure to the burden which the Chancellor of the Exchequer already had to bear before the country. The scheme included the appointment of a British Commissioner for the management of North-Western lands, aid from England (which, however, we do not believe would have been anything more than a guarantee) for the Pacific Railway, and aid from Canada, in the shape of a military contingent or reserve, for the Jingo policy of aggrandizement. From Sir A. Galt's speech at Montreal, it may be inferred that something in the nature of an Imperial Zollverein had also been projected. Sir A. Galt's own appointment may be regarded as an instalment of Imperial Federation, and one of a very questionable kind, since it allows the policy of Canada to be controlled, not by public dispatches, but behind the curtain of the Cabinet. The appointment of a military attaché to the High Commissioner, announced in the London *Court Journal*, shows at once the height to which the fancy of Jingoism soared, and as we venture to think, the essential puerility of the scheme. All this seems startling:

yet there is nothing in it not warranted by the conventional sentiments which everybody has felt it his duty to repeat, and from bondage to which even the Liberal Opposition has but just begun to emerge. It is highly probable, that had Lord Beaconsfield triumphed and the scheme taken effect, the outspoken protests would have been few. Destiny ordained otherwise: while in mid-Atlantic the ambassador meditated on his approaching conference with the Jingo Chief, a sudden demise took place, and he landed to attend a funeral. Jingoism is dead. The conditions under which it was generated, and of which the chief was the arrogance bred by years of marvellous prosperity, are gone. In such a country as England, Conservatism is sure to rise again: it may even soon return to power; but for Jingoism there is no resurrection, and all designs here that depended on its ascendancy in England have now lost their fountain of life and will soon be laid in their parent's grave.

Two other things appeared from the same debate: the debt is to be increased by raising more loans in England, and the system of subsidizing immigration is to go on. For both purposes the powerful agency of the High Commissioner is to be employed. If the Loan Market, instead of being opened to us more freely, could be entirely closed against us for the next ten years, we should suffer no more than a drunkard would suffer by the shutting of the tavern door. As to the other matter, can any sight be more curious than that of a community losing its native born citizens by tens of thousands and aggravating the poverty which drives them from their home by paying subsidies for immigration from abroad?

—On the Banking and Currency Resolutions there was a heavy debate. The majority is solid, all the more so perhaps because in case of a general election not a few of its members would be sure to lose their seats, and the Government has everything its own way. Sir Leonard Tilley, we fear, will find

in time that whoever borrows money must pay interest, and that those who raise forced loans pay the highest interest of all; Such was the experience of the American Government in the case of the Legal Tender Act. The general rate of interest is falling; so much so that a conversion of the English Consols is in view; and those who keep steadily in the path of probity will get the full benefit of the fall. That article of the resolutions which makes the circulation of a bank the first charge upon its assets seems to meet with universal approbation. The warrant for it, and for general strictness in the legislative regulation of banks is obvious; their bills, though not legal tender, practically cannot be refused in the ordinary course of trade, and therefore the safeguard which individual discretion supplies in the case of a promissory note, must in the case of bank bills be supplied by the law. Otherwise the trade in money is like the trade in any other commodity, and no more than the trade in any other commodity, a proper subject for harassing and crippling interference. A general outcry against banks is preposterous; they are the vital organs of a commercial community; a man might as well raise an outcry against his own lungs and liver. In this country indeed, they are not only the dealers in money, but the commercial capitalists, and practically the partners of all the mercantile houses. A serious blow given to them would be felt not only by all the merchants, but by every man who receives daily wages. There is a sort of impression that they are powers of evil requiring as a check on their malign propensities to be continually bedevilled by the politicians, who are in the habit of styling themselves the nation. The fact, which everybody sees is the case of the United States, is that, under the present system, the politicians are themselves a trade, governed avowedly by principles of morality more lax than those which govern any other trade, having objects always distinct from the national interest, not seldom at variance with it; and that to keep their hands as much as possible off everything on which the welfare of industry, and the daily bread of the people depend, but especially off the great financial

institutions, is the plainest dictate of commercial self-preservation and one of the first duties of a patriot.

—Mr. Mills obtained returns, showing that each session of the Senate costs $140,000, and that this, like every other item of expenditure, is rising. No other step was taken in relation to the Reform of the Senate. Some scandalous scenes, one almost passing imagination, in the Senate itself, showed the futility of supposing that by importing lordly forms we can import lordly manners. We shall have to be content with good manners, which consist in respect not for the feelings of men of a certain class, but of all men. Not in that line does the Canadian Senate earn its pay. It is difficult to say in what line it does. This Session its principal achievement has been the rejection by a majority of one of the Bill legalizing Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister, a decision almost on the face of it wrong, since in a case of private affection, if the arguments are so evenly balanced, the decision ought to be in favour of liberty. The recent appointments to the Senate have been bestowed in the usual way, which is the only way possible. The idea that the Senate can be a representation of the general worth and intellect of the nation is utterly chimerical. Appointments, in the hands of a party leader, must be given as rewards for party services. The Senate will remain what it is, a gilded armchair for partisans who have done their work, till the thread of its existence is cut by the shears of an economical reform. Senator Alexander has hastened the coming of that day by exposing, though in a somewhat turbulent fashion, the large payments received in some cases for a merely nominal attendance.

—By the ire of the defrauded, the Bankruptcy Law has been repealed, and we are left in that department to the law of general scramble. Perhaps, some members of the House of Commons thought that they might give a popular vote, and that the Senate would again save them from the consequences.

The existence of an Upper Chamber is apt to diminish the sense of responsibility in the Lower, as has often appeared in the case of the United States. A year's trial of anarchy will probably suffice. The bane of Canadian commerce is long credit. Should the temporary absence of the securities afforded by a Bankruptcy Law tend in any measure to the shortening of credit, the inconvenience will be attended with gain.

—The Temperance Act having been declared valid, and Mr. Boultbee's dexterous side-thrust having been parried, the activity of the Prohibitionists will be increased. We trust that it is consistent with the utmost respect and sympathy for their end, to entertain misgivings as to the expediency of their means, and to incline to the belief that, in a free community, those who want to reform the private tastes and habits of their neighbours, must do it by promoting education, by writing, by preaching, above all by example, not by appealing to the strong arm of the law. The use of wine or beer may be unwholesome, as according to some medical authorities is the use of tea or tobacco, against which a crusade is actually on foot, and pledges are being taken in the United States; but unless it leads to intoxication it is not criminal; and we doubt the possibility as well as the justice of enforcing among freemen laws which treat it as a crime. In Maine, the evidence seems to show that the result of Prohibition is a development of Contrabandism and all its attendant evils, without a diminution of drinking; though in the Eastern States of the Union the people are of themselves so temperate, that Prohibition among them is the sign of virtue, not its cause. A Czar of Russia may order his subjects to cut off their beards: a King of Spain may order his subjects to change the shape of their hats: a free government can only act with the support of popular opinion, which will never practically sustain a police sufficiently strong and searching to root out a private taste not directly injurious to other citizens. Voluntary associations, such

as that of the Good Templars or the old and highly-respectable Teetotalism, stand of course upon an entirely different ground, and their members have only to be on their guard against false brethren and the wiles of politicians. A lawsuit the other day disclosed the fact that a journal, much revered by temperance men, was very glad to puff a brewery provided it was well paid for its service. In mending one hole, otherwise than by voluntary reform, you often make two, and perhaps more. The effect of the Licensing Act in Ontario, if we are correctly informed, has been to throw the liquor trade, to a great extent, into the hands of keepers of low dens, which are said to abound in the outskirts of Toronto, and which are sure to be far worse in every respect than taverns kept by responsible publicans; while at the same time a patronage of the most unconstitutional and dangerous kind is entrusted to a party government. The English Bishop who, in his speech against Prohibition, said he would rather have the people free than sober, put his sentiment into an objectionable form; but if he had said that the political evils of sumptuary legislation were a heavy set off to any good that it could do, he would have had experience on his side. Inspection and the use of detectives are inevitable concomitants of the system; but in communities such as ours inspection and the use of detectives mean corruption. The dire necessity which renders almost any measures legitimate in fighting against such a hydra as the English Liquor Interest, cannot be said to exist here. Everyone who has known our country long and well attests the spontaneous progress of temperance. In Mr. James Young's History of Galt—an instalment of a history of Canada of the right sort, as it recounts the efforts of the people, not the quarrels of the politicians—we find these words:—"The opinion is frequently expressed by superficial observers, that Temperance has made little progress, and that drinking, with all the evils of its train, continues to be as rife as ever. There could hardly be a greater mistake. The locality whose history we are now narrating, may be regarded as a not unfair criterion of the whole Province, and the change in the

drinking usages of society in and around Galt, within the memory of the present generation, amounts almost to a revolution. The baneful effects of drunkenness are, alas! lamentable enough yet, but it is believed to be no exaggeration to say, that more liquor was consumed in Galt during a Fall or Spring Fair day thirty years ago than is sold in all the present hotels in a week. There is doubtless ample room for further improvement, but it is undoubted that habits of sobriety have greatly increased, and the social reformer has reason to thank God and take courage." Has not the social reformer also reason to rely on the moral forces which have already done so much, and which, if sufficient, are infinitely preferable in their effect on character to the policeman's club?

To induce the whole human race entirely to renounce the stimulants, which have so long formed a part of its mixed and artificial diet, is surely a very difficult undertaking. The introduction of light and wholesome, in place of heady and unwholesome beverages, is far more feasible. In the wine-growing countries, the people, as a rule, are temperate, in the rational sense of the term. Bad whiskey is the real fiend, and no mean exorcist would be native wine, if Canada could succeed in its production.

Whatever may have been Mr. Boultbee's design, his proposal of an absolute majority deserves attention. Only by the general voice ought restrictions to be placed on private liberty. Unless the evil and the danger are great enough to call out a full vote, there can be no case for sumptuary legislation, nor is the law when passed likely to receive the popular support indispensable to its execution. Our municipalities would be in far better plight if bonuses had been subjected to the same check.

—The death of Mr. George Brown was a tragical and deplorable catastrophe. Had it taken place a few months earlier it would have been a political event of greater importance; but the change in the leadership of the Opposition marked the decline

of his power. Mr. Gordon Brown gazettes himself as the new Managing Director of the *Globe*. He announces that his journal will remain Grit, and, in half-masked opposition to Mr. Blake, will advocate the construction of the Pacific Railway. Mr. Blake need not fear, if he will be firm and true; but there is evidently room for a Liberal journal. Mr. Gordon Brown promises his patronage to morality, temperance, and religion. With regard to temperance, the promise will perhaps require modification, if intemperance should offer a large price, in the shape of an advertising contract, for "a friendly notice." Religion, if it is the religion of which the cardinal doctrine is the charity that thinketh no evil, has been much beholden to Mr. Gordon Brown's championship in the past, and will, no doubt, be much beholden to it in the future. We are promised also less of gall and malignity under the new management. We shall see whether the Ethiopian can change his skin. So far the indications have not been favourable. It was when the late manager had ceased to act, and Mr. Gordon Brown must have been in sole charge, that the *Globe* made an attack of peculiar virulence on Sir Charles Tupper, who had been simple enough to hold out his hand in friendship; and from the very brink of the grave, in which Mr. Gordon Brown tells us his rancour has been buried, he denounced some writer or speaker at Montreal who had ventured to disagree with him as a "traitor" and a "dastard." It has probably never occurred to him that the latter term is applicable to a journalist who has been all his life taking advantage of his position to strike defenceless men. We perceive, too, that he persists in the somewhat dirty habit of raking in low English journals for personalities to be flung on those who have the honour to be the objects of his hatred in this country.

—We read in the Toronto *Mail*—"The Moncton (N. B.) *Times* says that Prof. Goldwin Smith's hobby of government without party has been realized in that Province, having been in ex-

istence there for twelve years. It regards the conditions of administration there as a standing demonstration of the impracticability of securing political perfection by the banishment of party. It points out that, in the absence of party ties, Governments have to secure supporters in exchange for patronage, by providing bridges and road improvements, by granting railway subsidies and other methods of bartering public money for political support. The result is a system of organized corruption and scandalous bargaining for votes in the House, very different from the ideal condition of things which, as inferred by Prof. Goldwin Smith, was the result of abolishing political parties. That there are numerous evils connected with partizan government nobody denies, but Reformers who attack this as well as other existing systems always lose sight of the obligation they are under to propose equally efficient substitutes. Iconoclasm is always easy, but to supply the vacancies left by destructive criticism acceptably is a much more serious business."

The remark is wise, and has often received the meed of Conservative approbation; but it is not applicable in the present instance. The writer in question has never failed, in advocating the abolition of party government where no real ground for party exists, to tender what he deemed an efficient substitute. He has always proposed that in the place of making the offices of Government the prize of a perpetual conflict between two senseless factions, the Executive should be regularly elected by the Legislature for a fixed term, and by such instalments as to secure at once its administrative continuity, and its harmony with the current opinion of its constituents and the country. When New Brunswick has tried this plan and found that it fails, she will have practically confuted Mr. Goldwin Smith, though he would perhaps have a right to ask that the experiment should be made with fresh men, not with politicians inured to the rogueries of the party system. So far, instead of confuting him, she has confirmed, in a signal manner, his assertion that the system, in addition to its other obvious evils, is utterly unstable, and must collapse as often as there ceases to be a question of sufficient importance to supply a rational basis for party divisions. We can, however, hardly

suppose that the political corruption in New Brunswick without party is worse than it is with party in Quebec, and even in the Dominion. We read the following in the Toronto *Globe*, a strong advocate of Party Government and enemy of "hobbies":—

"The painter [of the Senate Chamber] can be at no loss for subjects, but we beg to suggest a few, which might be treated in a manner to arouse the interest of future generations. '*Sir John executing the nimble double-shuffle*' would be a highly instructive picture. '*Sir Charles Tupper viewing the Spring Hill coal mine*'—a fine chance to depict the mingling of semi-satisfaction and a 'longing for more' on the great man's face, also an opportunity to bring in Nova Scotian scenery. '*Sir John after telegraphing for another ten thousand*'—the regret that he had not made it fifteen thousand might be delicately expressed in the Chieftain's countenance. '*Mr. Langevin concealing the treasure*'—a truly noble subject, face placid, trousers' pockets bulging out, as the honourable gentleman hides away the three thousand six hundred and twentieth ten dollar bill. '*These hands are clean*'—a picture showing many incredulous and amazed faces crowded together, while the virtuously-smiling Chieftain extends his digits at arm's length."

Have the New Brunswick politicians, since the lamented demise of Party, outdone this? Was not the Speaker of the House of Commons, at Ottawa, the other day, led in effect to confess that he had been forced by party exigencies to appoint a number of useless men so that he was ashamed to make a return of them when required by an order of the House? We would venture to ask our worthy contemporaries, both in Toronto and Moncton, to go a little deeper into the question, which may be one of life or death to free institutions. We presume they know the history of Faction.

—It has been said that nothing gives so much pleasure to the neighbourhood as a murder, unless it be a charge of immorality against a clergyman. The Handford case has ended in an acquittal, but cases of the same kind are likely, and indeed are

beginning, to abound. People are no longer satisfied with the simple message of the Gospel, simply delivered by a man whose claims to attention are his character and his spiritual experience: perhaps a good many of them have begun to feel doubts more or less serious about the authenticity of the message itself. They want a bewitching orator. But when they get a bewitching orator they will be very apt to get a flirt; and as soon as a symptom of flirting appears the scandal-hunters will be upon the track, some neglected devotee being, perhaps, the first to raise the hue and cry.

—The government of Quebec, which seemed at a stand, has greased its wheels with a loan from the French Mother Country of $4,000,000 and a promise of $2,000,000 more if required, as it is sure to be. Borrowing is fatally seductive; it not only gets a government out of difficulty for the moment but it makes it popular by enabling it to increase expenditure; and who cares for the government that is to follow? A triumph of the Ministry when the House meets may be expected as the result of what is really a downward step for the Province. The Quebec labour riots have signalized the fierce antagonism which exists between the French and Irish races, and which no common feeling of Canadian citizenship seems to have tempered in the slightest degree. The war is for the present at an end, but the mode in which it was terminated is itself of sinister import. The law, constituted authority, respect for order, civil duty, all were unavailing. But the combatants dropped their arms, when they were commanded to do so, under pain of excommunication, by a priest. Let justice be done to the character and influence of the priesthood of Quebec; perhaps that specimen of theocracy is about as good as any in the world. Still, society is in a bad way where civil order depends on the fear of bell, book, and candle: even among the multitudes that fear is diminishing daily. For the use of his talisman the priest demands his price, and the price

which he demands is the repression of intellectual progress. A good constabulary might cost less.

—A large meeting has been held at Montreal in favour of commercial union. It is said that the meeting was confined to the French, but, if it was, the feeling is not. Mr. Perrault, who was the chief speaker, has, at least, done the country the service of manfully asserting freedom of opinion. This is a question, to a great extent, between the interest of the politicians and that of the people: the interest of the people is at last finding spokesmen, and it is likely to find more if commercial matters in Quebec continue in their present train. To denounce Mr. Perrault and his friends as agitators, because they propose a change in our commercial policy, is absurd. Are not the advocates of an Imperial Zollverein proposing a change? Have they not sent an envoy to England to give effect to their plan; and do they expect those who differ from them to sit with folded hands while they bind the country to what a great many of us deem a wrong policy for ever?

—New Brunswick still mourns over the exodus of her sons who are leaving her cities, and even her fields, in alarming numbers, many of the best young men being among the departures. Officers of the Volunteer Militia, we are told, deplore the attenuated condition of their battalions. These exiles go not to Manitoba, but to the United States. To the United States they will continue to go till, by the adoption of a commercial policy framed in the interests not of the knights but of the people, the prosperity of the United States is extended to Canadian homes.

—Whether General Grant wins or loses at Chicago—and the question will be settled while our number is in press—he has succeeded in drawing a sharp line of distinction between his character and that of General Washington. It has been said

that the praises bestowed by European writers upon Washington, for not having usurped a crown, were undeserved, inasmuch as to usurp a crown was not in his power. It is true; but it is also true that Washington did deserve the praise of perfect moderation and disinterestedness: he left, by his conduct, no room for doubting that had a crown been within his grasp it would have been peremptorily and proudly declined. He was heartily content with having saved his country, and never did his pure glory wrong by coveting, much less by courting, any other reward. He not only did not seek the Presidency, directly or indirectly, but he would have shrunk from the thought of seeking it: we can no more imagine him manœuvring for a nomination, or consenting that others should manœuvre for him, than we can imagine him associated with Murphy or Belknap, and supported by Don Cameron on one hand and Logan on the other. Grant's conduct has been precisely the reverse. He belongs to a lower race of men—to an interregnum between the high-minded English gentleman of the Washington type, and the still more high-minded citizen, whom, when democracy has worked off the vices of its infancy, it is to be hoped the future will produce. We do not go with his extreme censors; we remember his good qualities as well as his services, and we do not in the least suspect him of any designs against the liberties of his country. But he has, at least, half cancelled his title to public gratitude. To tell us that he did not seek or desire the nomination, is to insult our credulity. Are we to believe that he has been identified against his will with all the intrigues and machinations of the last six months? Are we to believe that he was unconscious of the object with which the masters of the Machine exerted themselves to work up his popularity, and engineered ovations for him abroad and at home? Can we forget the ambiguous and equivocating answers which he gave to all questions as to his intentions, and on which present events throw a lurid light? It is said that, of late, he has modestly shrunk from appearing in the great centres. His managers were very wise in making

him keep away from the cities, where he cuts a sorry figure, and appear in rural districts, receiving ovations which could be chronicled in the newspapers as evidences of the attachment of the people. Nothing can be a stronger proof of the peril than the cunning with which the game has been played. We are told that there can be no danger in perpetuating the power of this soldier, and of the set of intriguers who surround him and look to him for their booty, because at each successive election the ballot will be in the hands of the American people, and they are perfectly competent to vote right. They are perfectly competent to vote right when they are allowed to vote at all. But this Third Term intrigue is a sample ef the manner in which the nomination, which is practically decisive, is taken out of the hands of the people and grasped by the proprietors of the Machine. Unorganized masses, without leaders, however sensible and patriotic the masses may be, have little chance against the malignant but skilfully directed energy of a compact gang of trained and unscrupulous politicians.

—It is now a dead pull between the good and the evil genius of the Republic. There is plenty of force on the right side, if it can only be brought to bear; and efforts to bring it to bear are being made. Honest, quiet citizens and men of refinement, who generally shrink from politics, are beginning to bestir themselves, as they did at the crisis of the civil war. Mr. George William Curtis, the Editor of *Harper's Magazine*, a man who unites practical energy and courage with high culture and purity of character, has raised the standard of resisttance to the Machine in New York, and his following is so large that the Conkling Machine candidate for the Governorship would have lost his election if he had not been saved by a counter bolt from the Tilden Machine. The part which these men have to play is a hard one, and their usual abstention, though much to be deplored, is not inexcusable. To tell them to attend Primaries is a mockery; if they go, they find every-

thing pre-arranged by the wire-pullers, and are only laughed at for their pains. They are excluded from all the prizes of political life, for, of course, there is nothing a Machinist hates and dreads so much as integrity and independence. If they become at all prominent, they are pelted with filth by the organs which are in the service of the Machinists. They have not only to sacrifice their time and their energy, but to bear all sorts of annoyance, without any reward but the consciousness of doing their duty, while the fruit of their efforts is both precarious and remote. It is amusing to see how the Machinists on this side of the line sympathize with the Machinists on the other, and echo the charges of over-refinement and waywardness against those who do not wish to see their country delivered over to an organized domination of rogues.

It is not altogether true that history never repeats itself. The language of Plato about the vices and the coarseness of democracy at Athens very closely resembles that of men of refinement in the United States about American democracy at the present day, and shows that the Machine in the hands of Cleon and Hyperbolus, was a pretty exact prototype of the Machine in the hands of Cameron and Conkling. Plato is an abstentionist. He holds that it is the part of a wise man to stand aside under the shelter of the wall, and let the swirl of dust go by. But then he has his Utopia, and fancies he can persuade some enlightened autocrat to realize it for him. The sufficient reason for accepting democracy, and making the best we can of it, is, that there is nothing else to be done. It is manifestly the outcome of the ages, and our inevitable lot. A man of sentiment may pine for something more sentimental—for the age of Louis XIV., for the age of chivalry, or, if he can blindly surrender himself to historic fancy, for the age of the Cæsars; but he will pine in vain. Monarchy and aristocracy are visibly dying, even in Europe; monarchy has sunk to etiquette, aristocracy to mere title; and who can dream that it is possible to introduce them here? That democracy combines in it the promise of something grander than the grandeurs

of the past, is, perhaps, only a whisper of hope. But it is certain that the lot of the masses in democratic countries is better than it ever has been under monarchy or aristocracy, not only in respect of pumpkin pie, but in respect of intelligence and virtue. On refinement no doubt democracy at first bears hard. But refinement must remember what it owes to toil. Exclusion from seats in Congress is no great hardship. After all the world is governed by opinion, which every man of intellect and culture may help to form, more than by Congresses and Parliaments. The people are not devoid of sense, and when they see that a man has no selfish aims, and seeks no place or pelf at their hands, they will allow him as much influence as he deserves. If Plato was an abstentionist, his master was not. Socrates bravely performed all the duties of an active citizen. Let the fastidious man of culture, when he feels inclined to shirk public duty from the fear of contact with coarseness, or of the whiff of a slanderous newspaper, think how many American farmers left their homesteads in the civil war, to face death for the Union, though they had no more chance of profit or military distinction than he has of the gains and honours of public life.

In one respect Mr. George Curtis is not up to the mark. He is still in bondage to the idea of Party. He says that Party has won all the good things—the British Reform Act, the Repeal of the Corn Laws, the victory in the struggle for the Union. These are not very happily chosen instances. The British Reform Act was won by a political uprising of the nation against an oligarchy which altogether transcended the ordinary action of Party. The Repeal of the Corn Laws was carried in defiance of party ties, by Peel, who was politically assassinated by the bravoes of Party for his pains. The victory in the struggle for the Union was won by a national effort, in which a large body of war Democrats stood shoulder to shoulder with Republicans. But granting that Party is, or has been in the past, necessary as the instrument of organic change, and that to the extent of that necessity it is moral,

does this prove that it can be made the regular basis of government, irrespective of any need for organic change, and that it will be moral when kept on foot merely for its own sake? If Mr. Curtis is of that mind, he may spare himself further trouble. As Party is, so in all ordinary times it will be: it will need wire-pullers, and it will have to hire them; it will fight for spoils and divide them; it will have Machines, and the Machinists will be intriguers. But it is hardly conceivable that the present organizations, at least in the United States, should long hold together. The Liberals bolt on one side, Tammany bolts on the other. The conflict between the Third-Term and the Anti-Third-Term sections of the Republican party in this election is fiercer, and waged for more vital objects, than that between the Republican Party, as a whole, and the Democratic Party. It is impossible, indeed, to conceive any difference more fundamental than between the advocates and the opponents of a Military Presidency for life. Attachment to names, and the habit of allegiance to a faction are strong, no doubt, but they can hardly stand such a strain as this. Perhaps the liberation of the Republic from Party may come from the least likely quarter—a Presidential convention

—In the States they are reading "A Fool's Errand," a satire on Reconstruction, in the form of a tale. A confiding Northern man settles in the South, in reliance on the effect of the Reconstruction Acts, which he fancies will make the South like the North. Instead of this he finds Southern society just what it was, struggles with it vainly, and at last succumbs. Reconstruction was a notable display of the sort of statesmanship which is formed in the management of Machines. Those wise men believed that, by giving votes to a slave race, fresh from the yoke, ignorant as beasts, and without a political idea, they could turn them into active, intelligent, and self-reliant citizens, able to cope with their masters in the arena of

public life. They had no notion of the peculiar social character which slavery had formed in the dominant race, or of the impassable gulf by which the two races were separated from each other. They had no notion that the dominant race would refuse to descend from its position and continue to struggle for ascendancy. They fancied that they could turn a Southern into a Northern State by a Constitutional Amendment. As might have been foreseen, the result has been the reduction of the Negro to complete political subjection by the dominant race, and his practical disfranchisement, while his nominal enfranchisement has increased by two-fifths the power of the Southern whites. It is a shallow optimism which pretends that there are not great calamities in history, and few have been greater than the introduction of the Negro into the New World. Time will show whether Southern society can ever get rid of the taint of slavery: primæval slavery is worked off like other habits of the savage state: but when a nation, in its maturity, has once been based on the system, regeneration is evidently hard. Christianity failed to regenerate the slave society of ancient Rome. In the Southern States the intermarriage of the races is impossible; without intermarriage there can be no social equality; and without social equality there can be no real political equality, make what laws you will. The idea that factions will spring up in the dominant race, and the weaker faction will have to court the Negro, is fallacious: the dominant race will be kept united by antagonism to the Negro, and to the party outside which is trying to enforce equality in his interest. Southern Society still repels Northern immigration, and retains its old and semi-barbarous character. A separation of the races, by a great Negro exodus, is the only hope of terminating their unhappy relations to each other. Manufactures are rising up in Georgia; this is about the most hopeful sign. Fortunately the South remains stationary, while the North grows so fast that the relative strength of the malign influence is always on the wane.

—It seems that Whittaker's case was one of self-inflicted injuries; a curious instance of the trickiness which is said to be characteristic of the mulatto. Nevertheless it is important, as showing the folly of trying to do violence to a rooted antipathy of race. The brand of slavery may be removed; but there is a physical repugnance which no cap of freedom can annul. It is very calamitous, but so it is: men of the Wendell Phillips school, sincere in their enthusiasm as they are, do not marry their children to Negroes. Attempts to override the repugnance will only aggravate it, and deprive the Negro of the chance which he might have of improving his condition by the use of his aptitudes, without presenting himself as the rival of the white. Everyone will rejoice at the acquittal of West Point, which is one of the soundest institutions in the States. Seldom, amidst all the peculations and malversations of the Civil War, did the breath of suspicion sully the character of a West Point man.

—The crowing of our Tariff men has awakened our neighbour, who is beginning to threaten us with stoppage of the transmission of our goods in bond, and other measures of retaliation. Happily, while he holds out the screw in one hand he holds out the olive branch in the other: for there is little doubt that he would treat for commercial union. But his threat against the bonding system shows us how much we are in his hands, and how vain it is to call Manitoba a part of Canada, fiscally, commercially, or in any other respect, while our only access to her is through the territory of what is supposed to be a hostile power. We are to create an Anti-American Empire—by kind permission of the Americans.

—With a party full of sectional divisions and rivalries, Mr. Gladstone has had a difficult job of Cabinet-making. The result is a Cabinet of Whigs and moderate Liberals, with a Radical representation. The Radicals are represented in the Cabinet

by Mr. Chamberlain, and they have a large interest in Mr. Bright; while of the minor offices, which are the stepping-stones to power, two are held by Mr. Fawcett and Sir Charles Dilke. Mr. Mundella is also a thorough-going Liberal as well of great and deserved influence among the working class. The four new men whom we have named are the most notable accessions. The most notable omissions are Lord Cardwell, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Goschen, and Mr. Stansfeld. Lord Cardwell and Mr. Lowe probably feel the influence of the evening hour: their voices will still be heard in the councils of the party; and neither of them is likely to show any of the petty restlessness which transforms an ex-colleague into a candid friend. Mr. Goschen, taking a severely economical view of things, is stiff on the subject of the County Franchise; he is sent to Constantinople to regulate Ottoman finance, which it is to be hoped he will do without putting on the Turkish taxpayers the merciless screw which, unconsciously no doubt, he put on the Egyptian Fellahas. A Cabinet will not, like a street car, hold an unlimited number; this probably is the only reason for the exclusion of Mr. Stansfeld, whose propensity for Female Suffrage was practically harmless, and did not interfere with his administrative powers. He will probably be taken up as soon as a passenger is set down. The non-appointment of Mr. Forster to the Colonial Secretaryship, which rumour assigned him, may possibly indicate that drab Jingoism is not more congenial to the Government than the scarlet variety: his appointment to the Irish Secretaryship indicates only that the office is one of hard work. Dismay has been spread among the followers of John Knox by the nomination of a Papist as Viceroy of India. Lord Ripon is unlike the other perverts to Rome. Most of them have been drawn by political or social sympathies to the Church of the Reaction; but Lord Ripon has kept his Liberalism unimpaired. If the appointment is made with any view of conciliating the Roman Catholic hierarchy, it will probably prove a failure, as all Liberal manœuvres of that kind have: the hierarchy knows very well that the interests of ecclesiastical and political reaction are one.

—The great representative of the decided Liberal element after all, is the Prime Minister, in whom everybody feels that there are possibilities of progress bounded only by the Psalmist's limitation of life, which itself is losing its validity in an age of septuagenarian statesmen, generals, and emperors. It is easy to understand why Mr. Gladstone is an object of almost frantic hatred to the Tory aristocracy, and of perfectly frantic hatred to their wives. He is not only a Radical and the most powerful of Radicals, but a renegade, and a renegade equipped in an armour of culture and social rank borrowed from the arsenals of those whom he has deserted. Mr. Bradlaugh is a son of Eblis, stamped with his father's likeness and doing his father's work: but Mr. Gladstone is an apostate child of light. Yet the people are right in thinking that not only was Mr. Gladstone's change of party perfectly sincere and honest, but that his course has been really one of consistent progress, though it has, no doubt, described a remarkable curve. He has never, like his rival, tried one market, and failing there, gone over and tried the other. He had the disadvantage, as it must be reckoned, if consistency is a statesman's chief merit, of coming forward as a public man and committing himself to pronounced opinions when he was very young. His public life may be almost said to have begun at Eton, where his precocity, both as an orator and a political student, made him the hero of the School debating society, named from the ginger beer shop, over which its meetings were held, "Pop." At Oxford, he was not only the leader of the University debating society, but had actually begun to be known in the great world as the orator and politician of the rising generation. He spoke then nearly as well, in point of form and command of language, as he does now; a great advantage for a *debutant* in Parliament, but one for which he paid the forfeit always paid by those who acquire facility by practising in debating societies—total loss of freshness of style. In force, copiousness, energy, and impressive earnestness as a debater, he is unrivalled, as well as in power of exposition, es-

pecially when he has a great measure in his charge; his hearers are carried away by the impetuous flood and swept onwards to the speaker's conclusions; but it is as difficult to read one of his speeches as it is to read one of his essays: they will not bear comparison with the more highly-wrought passages in the speeches of Lord Beaconsfield, much less with the Demosthenic simplicity and vigour of John Bright. In his early days he was unquestionably a Tory: he went into parliament as the nominee of that more than Tory Duke of Newcastle, who, when he was taken to task for coercing the voters on his estates, asked, with astonishment, whether he had not a right to do as he liked with his own. But Gladstone's Toryism was not so much political as ecclesiastical; it was the Toryism of Laud and Ken rather than that of Liverpool and Eldon. Religion was, as it still is, the basis of his character. The prime object of his affection was the Church of England, in his eyes the one true Church, which he deemed it incumbent on the nation as a Christian community to establish and to accept as the guide of its conscience in all its collective acts. His first work was "Church and State," which, as every one knows, was cut up in a trenchant review by Macaulay, who predicted that the writer would one day be the most unpopular man in England, a prophecy of which fate has made sport in a curious fashion. Like the Oxford Tractarians, under whose influence he was trained, he objected to Liberalism not so much because it took power out of the hands of the Crown and the aristocracy, as because it tended to the disestablishment of the Church, and to the destruction of the Christian character of the State. The Eldonian idea, which is that also of the Tory party of the present day, that the Church is to be upheld as a useful outwork of Conservative institutions, would have seemed to him the height of profanity. For territorial aristocracy he never, we believe, showed any special affection, nor was there anything in his early associations to give him that bias, his family having made its wealth by trade. The truth is, that deeply religious men, however Conservative in tem-

perament, are not likely to be political Tories of the ordinary kind. A defence of narrow class interests has nothing in it congenial to their sentiment of Christian brotherhood; they do not share the selfish fears of wealth or privilege; their affections do not much centre in secular institutions, nor do they look to them for that which they chiefly desire; they feel that in this matter the fashion of the world passes away, and that the only real stability is that of character. Mr. Gladstone commenced his Parliamentary career under Peel, a chief who, perhaps, better than any other Prime Minister of England, discharged one of a political leader's highest duties by selecting and training young men for public life, and bequeathed to England a splendid legacy of statesmen formed under his eye. In his choice of his lieutenants Peel was magnanimous and comprehensive; he did not look out for mere tools, nor where he knew that there was ability and industry was he repelled by the peculiarities of characters even most uncongenial to his own. To that thoroughly unsentimental and secular man of business Mr. Gladstone's ecclesiastical fancies could not fail to be repugnant, yet he never allowed them to ruffle or estrange him, and when Mr. Gladstone had quitted him on account of a conscientious objection to the Maynooth grant, which to him must have appeared fantastic and provoking, he welcomed him back again with undiminished kindness. He had seen in his young lieutenant the qualities which he most valued, patient industry, a thorough mastery of public business, and hearty devotion to the public service, besides the highest parliamentary power. At this moment Mr. Gladstone fixes attention as a party leader. He has borne down by sheer moral force the tactics of his opponent; but as a tactician he is far inferior to Lord Beaconsfield; he is indeed so wanting in strategy, and in the sort of knowledge required for it, that the politicians of Westminster have more than once been disposed to discard him as a total failure, though they have discovered their mistake when from the Clubs an appeal has been made to the people, who know little about tactics and are

impressed more by the greatness of the man. It is as a legislator, and especially perhaps as a commercial and financial legislator, that he will stand highest in parliamentary history: the mass of work that he has done in this way is enormous, and includes much, like the Post Office Savings Bank Act, for which no party motive can be assigned, and which aims simply at promoting the welfare of the people. He also shared with Peel the glory of the reformed tariff, and of the immense successes of English finance.

When Peel broke with the Tory aristocracy on the subject of the Corn Laws, he carried all his lieutenants except Lord Derby (then Lord Stanley) with him; and both on the economical question and on the question between the interest of a privileged class and that of the people, it may be safely assumed that Mr. Gladstone went heartily with his chief. The Peelites for a time occupied a middle position: after the death of Peel they gradually blended with the Liberals. The popular fibre which had always been really strong in Mr. Gladstone was called into activity by his new connection; and he gradually found himself borne beyond the Whig section of the Liberal party and drawn close to Bright and Cobden, to whom he was also allied by his love of economy and peace. In foreign policy his Liberalism and his love of righteousness are nothing new. If there are any who fancy that his sympathy with Greeks and Bulgarians is put on for a party purpose, let them remember how ardently, while still associated with Conservatives, he pleaded the cause of Italy and denounced the Bourbon tyranny at Naples. Inevitably he became an object of special odium to the Tories, and Lord Beaconsfield found that he could call him a "Jack Cade" without outrunning Tory sentiment. His "flesh and blood" argument in favour of the extension of the suffrage to the working class called forth a peal of execration, in which the shrill voice of the great Tory ladies was distinctly heard, as well as the deeper one of their lords. It was constantly said and perhaps believed in high circles that he was insane: and for several successive seasons London was asked to be-

lieve a very circumstantial story of his having bought the whole contents of a toy-shop and ordered them to be sent to his house. A preternatural activity, sustained by extraordinary nervous energy, which knows no repose, and when it is not framing Acts of Parliament or Budgets, is constructing theories of the Homeric Poems or mingling in theological discussion, lends a sort of a colour to a calumny otherwise ridiculous. There is weakness, no doubt, in the literary side of Mr. Gladstone's character. His facility misleads him. His powers are wasted on abstruse subjects which he has not had leisure to master. Yet it is pleasant to see a statesman not entirely absorbed in the game of political ambition, nor making its prizes his only aim, but anxious to do his part in promoting the broad interests of humanity and the search for vital truth. In religious convictions, so far as doctrine is concerned, Mr. Gladstone has remained true to his first love; and his close association with High Churchmen and disposition to give them more than their share of everything, was a weak point in his position as Minister. But he has left far behind him the old theories about the relation of the Church to the State: at heart, probably he is a Free Churchman: he has carried Disestablishment in Ireland, and now receives the enthusiastic support of all the English Nonconformists, who expect him to proceed in the same course. Besides, the general peril of religion in a sceptical age has drawn him nearer to all religious men and all religious men nearer to him. In the struggle with Jingoism, the friend of Newman and Pusey has found his best backing in Presbyterian Scotland.

A stronger contrast there could not be than that between Mr. Gladstone and his rival. It has been said ten thousand times, nevertheless it is true, that the career of Lord Beaconsfield has been a fulfilment of "Vivian Grey;" and "Vivian Grey" is a reverie of successful intrigue, precociously clever, and prematurely cynical. A legislator Lord Beaconsfield has never sought to be: in more than forty years he has not placed upon the Statute book a single measure of first-rate import

ance, saving the Suffrage Bill of 1867, which itself was merely the embodiment of an intrigue. Much he has talked, in his Tory-Chartist strain, of improving the lot of the poor and of *sanitas sanitatum*, but very little has he done. The solicitor in whose office he learned law said of him afterwards, with unconscious piquancy, that he had not been good at hard work, but first-rate at drawing prospectuses. He has since drawn prospectuses to some purpose. His singular genius as a tactician has never been wanting to his fortune, while on the other hand fortune has been kind to him. Six special pieces of good luck have befallen him—the quarrel between Peel and the Protectionists; the appearance upon the scene and then the death of Lord George Bentinck; the death of Peel; the accession of Lord Derby to the Conservative leadership; and the Jingo movement, which had its origin in social circumstances wholly out of his control. All his early combinations and programmes, Tory-Chartism which he tried with Mr. Walter, the proprietor of *The Times*, and Young Englandism which he tried with a little circle of sentimental slips of nobility, came to nothing; and under the Peel *régime*, not being good at hard work, he was in danger of being stranded. Then came the split in the party about the Corn Laws, and he found among the infuriated landowners a market for vitriol such as does not present itself once in a century. That he had flattered Peel with more than Oriental fulsomeness, sought place under him, and poured ridicule upon the Corn Laws in Popanilla, was of no consequence to the tactician. Still his motives were so much on the surface, and his character was so well known, that he would hardly have succeeded in permanently splitting the party, had he not found an instrument in Lord George Bentinck, a fanatical Protectionist with a violent temper, easily played upon, a brother of the Duke of Portland, and a man who exercised great influence over the squires. By copiously flattering Lord George, and adding fuel to his rage, Mr. Disraeli made him his own, and through him brought about a permanent split, which took off not only Peel but all the leading men of the party except Lord Derby, and

left the leadership of the remnant open to the aspirations of "Vivian Grey." But with Agricultural Protection tied round its neck, the new party could not have floated, and to rid it of that incumbrance was impossible while Lord George Bentinck lived. Just at the nick of time Lord George Bentinck suddenly died, and no sooner was he out of the way, than Mr. Disraeli, now promoted to the first place, made haste to get rid of Protection. The equally sudden death of Peel removed another obstacle equally fatal; for while Peel lived, though he had lost his Tory following, he remained at the head of the nation, which would unquestionably have called him back to power and put all factions under his feet. Mr. Disraeli would have been unable to prevent that consummation, which would have reduced him again to comparative insignificance. Carlyle has expressed the general feeling with perfect fidelity, though with characteristic ruggedness, in one of his Latter Day Pamphlets, in which he calls upon Peel to undertake the Reform of Downing Street, and pours utter contempt on the possible opposition of Mr. Disraeli. The hearts of the young men of that day especially were on the side of the great statesman who, in trying to rise above party and to govern for the good of the whole nation, had been stabbed by the poniard of faction or of something viler still. A plunging horse cleared Mr. Disraeli's path of Peel, as an apopletic fit cleared it of Lord George Bentinck. Still he could not have led the Conservative party without Lord Derby to act the part of the Marquis of Carabas in "Vivian Grey." Lord Derby was formed by destiny for that part. He was a brilliant, proud, ambitious, but at the same time indolent aristocrat, very jealous of Sir Robert Peel, whom he despised as a cotton spinner, and exceedingly open to those arts of which Mr. Disraeli was the supreme master. The spirit of gambling, which he had imbibed on the Turf, made him an extremely useful instrument of an adventurous policy; no Conservative leader except him could have been persuaded to take such "a leap in the dark," to use his own phrase, as Household Suffrage, or have been perfectly consoled for the peril

into which he had brought his party and the country by the thought that he had "dished the Whigs." The victory of 1867 was gained by a junction with a section of the opposite party, Mr. Disraeli's favourite stroke of strategy. An appeal to the constituencies as reorganized by himself, however, left him in a minority of a hundred. But fortune was again kind: from the effect produced on the character of the nation by a decade of extraordinary prosperity, came at once a plutocratic reaction and Jingoism; and Mr. Disraeli, who has always studied with a sagacious eye what he calls the "spirit of the age," was lifted higher than ever by the friendly tide and borne back to supreme power for six years, when his career was closed by the reviving sense and morality of the nation. He has more than realized his youthful visions; he has enjoyed to the full all that his heart desired; he has been the Prime Minister and the favourite of the Court; he has made the Queen an Empress; he has been the most prominent figure in a Congress of Great Powers; he has dazzled not only England, but Europe; he has had a dozen dukes at his table at once, and has himself created dukes. We put the last as the climax, because it is believed to be the climax in his own mind. Of his legislation and his policy, not a vestige will remain. Jingoism is defunct; personal government has wilted in an instant; Tory Democracy has gone to the grave of Bolingbroke, leaving upon the Conservatives the stain of a futile conspiracy to swamp the intelligence and worth of the nation by an alliance with ignorance and beer. The Conservative party, had it not lent itself to the object of Mr. Disraeli's ambition by throwing over Peel, who had combined organic Conservatism with administrative progress, might have retained power under Peel himself and a succession of leaders trained by him from that hour to this, instead of being out of power for about four-fifths of the time. It is now more prostrate than it has been since the Reform Bill of 1832. The Crown, instead of being exalted, has been humbled, and owes its humiliation most distinctly to Lord Beaconsfield. It can hardly be doubted that under his inspiration the attempt was made to frustrate the decree of

the nation by keeping Mr. Gladstone out of power. To send for Lord Granville, the recognised leader of the Opposition, was the obvious course, and the one which the Sovereign, left to herself, would have pursued. But to send for Lord Granville, was to send for Mr. Gladstone: the two men are political brethren in arms; and as Lord Granville would have retained the leadership of the House of Lords, and had not acted much as the leader of the party, he would not have been called on to make a great sacrifice. But between Lord Hartington and Mr. Gladstone there was no strong bond; and Lord Hartington would be called on to give up his leadership of the House of Commons and step down to a lower place. Therefore, it was hoped that a succesful appeal might be made to Lord Hartington's ambition, and that he might be induced to serve the purpose of those who wished to exclude Mr. Gladstone. Lord Hartington's good sense and generosity foiled the intrigue, and proved, not for the first time, that the most consummate tacticians are apt to outwit themselves by forming too low an estimate of the character and motives of other men.

We were wrong in saying that Lord Beaconsfield's career would leave no trace. It will leave a trace, for some time at least, in the altered tone of English public life. Nobody can doubt that, in point of veracity and what is generally called honour, there is a difference between the English character and the Oriental. Hitherto the word of an English statesman has been above impeachment; but under the administration of Lord Beaconsfield there have been constant complaints, not only from English opponents of the Government, but from foreigners and neutrals, of prevarication and deception. The rejection of the moderate Reform Bill of Lord Russell, in 1866, and the substitution for it of Household Suffrage, in 1867, were accomplished by a process of what Lord Salisbury called "legerdemain," involving the practice of duplicity on the largest scale. In this line Lord Beaconsfield has had the sinister advantage of originality: he has operated in an assembly where legerdemain was easy, because before him it had been unknown. It is a sin-

gular proof of his power of influencing other men, that suspicion has of late extended to the statements of the proud Lord Salisbury and the respectable Sir Stafford Northcote. The wreck of Lord Salisbury's high character is one of his trophies, and if he desired to take vengeance on his haughty censor he has fully achieved his aim, while the world is once more taught that no rank, no wealth, will keep a man above the influence of temptation in public life and that his only real safeguard is one which dwells in his own breast.

Among the small consequences of a great catastrophe is the ejection of Mr. Frederick Greenwood from the editorship of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which he has been making the organ of an almost delirious Jingoism, and in which he propounded his glorious scheme for seizing all the waterways of the world. The most notable part of the fracas is that this gentleman, who not only is reputed to be an Agnostic, but in his editorial columns has promulgated Agnosticism in the most trenchant style, and to whom the religious part of Mr. Gladstone's character was an object of peculiar hatred, nevertheless insisted that the journal should continue to support the State Church. This is startling, but far from unique. There are now in England many Tory-Atheists who avowedly uphold the State Church at once as a political bulwark and as an antidote to religious enthusiasm. France has always been familiar with the compound of the Legitimist and the Voltairean : a specimen of it occupied the throne in the person of Louis XVIII. But in England this interesting variety of opinion has hardly been seen since Hume and Gibbon, and in its present development may be said to be the offspring of the present day.

—The new Government has met with some reverses at starting, but variable as English opinion has undoubtedly become, it is absurd to suppose that it can have changed in a month, and before the Ministers had even met Parliament. The Home Rulers have gone round, and probably they alone. Mr. Gladstone's apology to Austria, published without the rest of the

correspondence, may have done some mischief; but small boroughs are swayed by small influences, often of a purely personal kind. The defeat of Sir William Harcourt at Oxford by a majority as narrow as that by which he was elected is probably a last desperate effort of beer. Mr. Hall, the Tory candidate, is a brewer. Beer has done its worst against the liberties of England: it has lost the game, and now, notwithstanding this last kick, it will pay the forfeit. Supposing the zeal of any of Sir William Harcourt's supporters to have been damped by his notorious hostility to Mr. Gladstone's Premiership, this would be anything but an evidence of reaction. Trustworthy correspondents tell us that the prostration of the Tory party is even greater than the election returns show. Loss of rents, from the fall in the price of grain and distress among the farmers, has come with political defeat. The incipient defection of the tenant farmers, in some districts, is an ascertained fact, and it is likely to spread. The power of the territorial aristocracy will hardly be again what it has been.

Whatever disasters may have befallen the new Ministry, a far greater has befallen the old, in the sudden revelation, since the election, of a hideous deficit in Indian finance, which, before the election, had been declared to be most flourishing. Considering that the Indian administration is the most highly trained and the most renowned in the world, a blunder of four millions is astounding. The political life of Lord Lytton and his advisers was bound up with that of the English Cabinet, and suspicion could not fail to attach to their double budget. People are reminded of the Abyssinian war, the cost of which, before the departure of the Tories from office, was estimated at two millions, but after their departure was found to have exceeded nine. Mr. Fawcett has got into a scrape by making a charge, his authority for which he could not produce. But it is surely not incredible that an unofficial whisper of the coming disclosure should have reached the late Government before the official communication.

—In many words the Queen's Speech tells us that it is too late to do anything this Session. Finance, which is left in a bad condition, will demand the immediate care of the Premier, who has taken the Chancellorship of the Exchequer for that purpose. But the chief task for the present will be the rectification of the foreign policy. The course of the ship cannot be reversed at once; yet if Mr. Gladstone's spirit prevails in his Cabinet, a change and a profound change will gradually be made. Balm has been applied to the wounded feelings of Austria, which, in her weakness, she will gladly accept; but the word to her, though more softly uttered, will still be "Hands Off." She will not be allowed to go on with the work to which Toryism set her, of battening down the hatches upon the struggling nationalities of the Balkans. The route to India will not be left unguarded, but the warders, in place of Ottoman decrepitude, will be young nations, the grateful clients of England. England will not be effaced, nor will her interest be abandoned, though in her councils the policy of Canning may prevail over that of Lord Beaconsfield. Russophobia, in its blindness, played into the hands of Russia by splitting Bulgaria into two, and thereby making her dependent on Russian patronage. This error will probably be repaired, and the borders of Greece will certainly be enlarged. We may also look forward to the restoration in Central Asia of the neutral zone, which all the wisest and most renowned of Anglo-Indian statesmen have deemed the best protection of the Empire. To retire from Afghanistan with honour, and without leaving anarchy behind, is difficult; but the utterances of the new Ministers assure us that the honour of England will soon cease to be sullied by the wholesale butchery of a gallant race, which is defending its native land, and which is the equal of its invaders in courage, though rendered helpless by the inferiority of its arms. But whatever may be its course in details, the new policy, if it is worthy of Liberal traditions, will be one of plain dealing, generosity, and respect for human right. Christendom will no longer be told by the envoys of England that it matters not

how many Bulgarians are massacred provided British interests are served.

In one respect events have relieved the new Ministry of embarrassment. The Ottoman Empire is a weltering chaos. There can be no further question about any obligation to maintain its "independence and integrity" into which the Tories may have entered. An empire of brute force and sensuality has reached its inevitable end. It was like a mere tactician to think that diplomacy could supply the place of moral and political life. Had Lord Beaconsfield chosen honestly to back his ambassador, and to be true to his confederates at the Conference of Constantinople, Turkey would have conceded the reforms demanded, and her existence might have been prolonged. She and humanity generally have paid pretty heavily for his lordship's ambitious desire to figure more gloriously on the diplomatic scene. It is safe to predict that, within ten years, the cross will have replaced the crescent on St. Sophia. What to do with Constantinople is supposed to be the great difficulty: but her importance is rather historical than actual. Once she was the centre of the Roman Empire and the link between its eastern and western portions: now she is at most only the key of the Black Sea, and the Black Sea is already a Russian lake. If she were made a free city with a district, under the guaranty of the Powers, the world, so far as she is concerned, might be at peace.

—Religious doubt spares no rank. His Grace of Queensbury losing his place among the representative Peers of Scotland for his renunciation of Christianity is a social set-off to Mr. Bradlaugh, who demurs to taking the oath for his seat in the House of Commons because he does not believe in God. Much scorn is poured on Mr. Bradlaugh for taking the oath after all. His wavering has most certainly been undignified. But, in even demurring to a test on conscientious grounds, he has shown more moral sensitiveness than many who have sat in the House before him. The Parliamentary members

of the Hell Fire Club not only took tests, but, we may be sure, revelled in the blasphemy. At this moment, the Duke of Somerset, who has evidently ceased to believe in Christianity, sits comfortably in a House confined by law to Christians. It is to be hoped that this revolting affair will, in its sequel, rid religion of the last test. "My kingdom is not of this world." Let any one consider how different the course of history would have been if that plain precept had been observed. No tests, no State churches, no Papacy, no persecutions, no Inquisition, no religious wars. Yet all these are now laid at the door of Christianity. Let the Gospel have a fair trial: it has hardly had one yet.

—In the Fortune Bay affair the Liberals have inherited an unpleasant legacy. Lord Salisbury is an imperious and impetuous man, apt to take up advanced positions and then retire. The moment he became Foreign Minister he fulminated a strong despatch against Russia in slashing newspaper style; then he came down and made a secret compromise with Count Schouvaloff. He was a strong sympathizer with the South and hates the Yankees, so that he is likely to have been haughty, while the Americans have rushed to extreme measures on their side. Arbitration will probably settle the present controversy. To the general question of the Fisheries there can be but one end —free fishing for the Americans with countervailing advantages for Canada; but we may expect a long series of quarrels before this end is reached.

—Let Mr. Ewens, or anybody else, say what he will, nobody need fancy that England is going back to Protection, or that an Imperial Zollverein will find acceptance. England is a country with a manufacturing population, out of all proportion to her agricultural area, and dependent on imported food. In their present situation, threatened by rivals on all sides, these people cannot afford to have a cent added to the price of their bread. On the other hand, the farmers, in their present plight,

would not hear of having clothes, and tools, and machines made dearer for the benefit of the manufacturers. In political force the two interests are nearly balanced, and the jealousy between them is strong. Though the late Government represented the old Protectionist party, it did not venture to do anything in that direction openly, though it did a little covertly, under pretence of taking precautions against the cattle plague. The long heads know perfectly well that if English commerce is declining, the cause is not the tariff, which is as well adjusted as possible to the special industries of the country, but the inevitable course of commercial events. After the Napoleonic wars England was left the only country in Europe with manufactures and a mercantile marine. From that pinnacle she is descending and must descend. She has passed her zenith, though she has accumulated wealth enough to keep her rich for many years to come.

—Looking to our Sister Colonies we see that the collision between the Upper and Lower Houses of the Legislature has extended from Victoria to South Australia and Tasmania. In Tasmania a strong desire has been expressed for the abolition of the Upper House. In all these cases the Upper House is elective, and where it is elective it is sure to fall foul of the Lower House; where it is nominative, as with us, it becomes an expensive nullity with a latent capacity for mischief. South Africa is still pressed to adopt Confederation. The fruits of Confederation without the national self-government, which is its proper coping-stone, will probably be there, as here, a vast development of faction, demagogism, corruption, and public debt, without any counterbalancing advantage. Additional evils are likely to result from the medley of races by which the different provinces are peopled, and the great preponderance in some of them of the native element. Cape Town, the principal settlement, may be expected to remain the head-quarters of political parties which will bid against each

other for the support of the lesser provinces, and a glorious auction of bribery there will be. The ablest of the local statesmen are opposed to the measure, and have so far managed to keep Downing Street at bay.

—All is still quiet in France, and it does not appear that resistance will be made to the execution of the law against the Jesuits, on which the Government seems resolved. Prince Napoleon, the Pretender to the Empire, by declaring in favour of the law and the Government, shows that to him the strength of public opinion appears to be on that side. In determining the rights of the question it is to be remembered, first, that the Church is not a Free Church, but in the pay of the State; and secondly, that she is a standing conspiracy against the Republic. That the Republicans, masters of the State, should be content to leave the fangs in the cobra was hardly to be expected. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the champions of liberty in France are always in some danger of playing the tyrant. Frenchmen have made great progress in constitutional ideas and habits; witness the orderly and thoroughly moral triumph of the people over the DeBroglie conspiracy. But they have not yet completely learned respect for freedom of opinion. Through long ages the nation was under the training of royal and priestly persecutors who treated conscientious dissent as a crime and extirpated it with the sword. From that school came forth the Jacobins, who, in their Reign of Terror applied the lessons of sanguinary persecution to the teachers, and enforced universal assent to their creed in turn with the guillotine and the bayonet. Each successive party in France, as it became dominant, has endeavoured in like manner to enforce unity of opinion. Slowly, very slowly, the better policy gains ground. In the political spheres, though the literal decapitation of heretics has ceased, official decapitation still prevails, and the dismissal of all suspected office-holders, down to the lowest, is clamorously demanded by the Extreme Left. The

Jesuits are not French citizens: they are the intrusive emissaries of an alien power, fiercely and avowedly hostile to the principles on which the Republic rests; and if they set up their schools in France, instead of setting them up in Spain or Calabria, where popular education is much more needed, their object is not the instruction but the political perversion of the young. These the French Republic may, without infringing liberty of opinion, send about their business, as the Swiss Republic did before it. But it would be the greatest of blunders, as well as of crimes, to commit the Republic to a violent crusade against the religion of the French people. Education, science, and the influence of free institutions are gradually doing their work; a strong reaction in favour of the priesthood, such as took place after the reign of the Jacobins, would be the only result of an attempt to hasten the day of intellectual emancipation by the use of political power.

—A thunderbolt was launched the other day from the Vatican against Divorce. This had special reference to France, where that question is burning, the leading champions of the change being Naquet and Dumas the younger. It seems that France is the only country in which a power of divorce does not, in one form or other, exist. It is there, moreover, that the battle between the Old Creed and the New—the Dogmatic and the Positive; the Mediæval and the Modern—is the fiercest, and the hostile opinions are most sharply defined. Like the two sides of a ravine, with an abyss between them, the party of St. Louis and the party of Voltaire confront each other. The political conflict though tremendous, may be said to be little more than the symbol of that which rages over the fundamental questions of morality, social relations, domestic life. On this, as on other occasions, the Papacy wishes to present itself as the guardian of moral law, threatened by the licentious tendencies of an unbelieving generation. Its own position is not so impregnable as it supposes. In this, among other matters, real laxity and flexi-

bility have gone with apparent strictness and unchangeableness. The 'Memoirs of Madame de Remusat' have brought again prominently under our notice the divorce of Napoleon. Was a greater blow ever given to the sanctity of marriage than that divorce? Was morality ever more openly prostrated before policy and power? Never, except perhaps when the Pope in person went to Paris to crown Napoleon, immediately after the murder of the Duc d'Enghien. The divorce was not the work of the Pope himself, but it was the work of the Church. There was an ecclesiastical pretext, of course; but nobody, looking to the history of the divorce, can doubt that it was a pretext and nothing more, so that falsehood and hypocrisy were added to the breach of the Moral Law. The courage with which in the Middle Ages Popes upheld morality, and especially the sanctity of marriage, against kings, has been the theme of praise not only with the panegyrists of the Papacy, but with philosophic historians. There is unquestionably ground for the belief that the ecclesiastical power was useful during these centuries as a check upon the secular, though it was, after all, a conflict of tyrannies, not a reign of right. But the time never was when the Papacy could not be kind to the vices of its faithful liegemen, and compromise for the purposes of its policy. Charlemagne, the great patron and benefactor of the Papacy, was canonized, or at least beatified, and thus held forth as the highest example to all Christian rulers. "But," says a historian, "the religious Emperor in one respect troubled not himself with the restraints of religion. The humble or grateful Church beheld meekly, and almost without remonstrance, the irregularity of domestic life, which not merely indulged in free license, but treated the sacred right of marriage as a covenant dissoluble at his pleasure." Charles put away his first wife to marry a Lombard princess; and, after a year, he put away that princess to marry Hildegard, a Swabian lady, In his later days he was living with four concubines. The marriage with the Lombard princess was, indeed, opposed by the Pope; not, however, on the ground of morality, but because the Lombards were the enemies of the Papacy.

This, not the breach of the marriage tie, was the reason why "the devil alone could have suggested that the noble, the generous race of the Franks, the most ancient in the world, should ally itself with the most fœtid brood of the Lombards, a brood hardly reckoned human, and who have introduced the leprosy into the land." In vigour of vituperation, at all events, the Vatican has preserved its ascendancy and its consistency. A Pope, by the terrors of the Church, compelled Philip Augustus of France, to put away Agnes of Meran, and take back his lawful wife, Ingelburga of Denmarck; and this is cited by Roman Catholic writers as a palmary instance of the beneficent use of the Papal power. But that same Pope allowed King John, of England, upon his accession to the Crown, to put away on a transparently false pretext his lawful wife Hawisa, and marry Isabel of Angoulême, though she was betrothed, if not married, to the Count of La Marche. What was the difference between the two cases? It was that, in the field of European politics, Philip Augustus was opposed to the Pope, while John was on his side. A great license of divorce was practically introduced among the European aristocracy before the close of the Middle Ages, under the colour of nullifying marriages on the ground of consanguinity. So numerous were the prohibited degrees, so close was the connection between the aristocratic families in each country, that casuistry could seldom fail to find a pretext of this kind. Henry VIII. would, no doubt, have obtained his divorce, or to speak strictly, the nullification of his marriage with his brother's widow, and liberty to marry again, if his influence at Rome had not been more than counterbalanced by that of the Emperor Charles V. The veil of hypocritical casuistry under which license was thus accorded to wealth and power is too thin to deceive any but an Ultramontane eye; every one can see that, in each case, had there been a sincere scruple on the ground of consanguinity, the proper course, in the interest of morality, would have been to grant a dispensation and require the parties to be married again. Louis XIV, if he did not, like Charlemange, practise polygamy, did practise con-

cubinage of the most open and scandalous kind, and thus, almost equally with Charlemagne, trample under foot the sanctity of marriage. But he was devoted, like Charlemagne, to the Church, and rose from the bed of licentiousness to persecute Protestant heretics in her interest. Therefore he remained her favourite, and no effectual protest against his vicious habits ever was uttered by her Head or by any of her ministers. Assuredly the countries in which the Church of Rome has been most completely dominant—France, under the old regime, Italy, Spain, the Spanish Colonies in South America—have not been those in which fidelity to the marriage tie or continence has most prevailed. The same induction seems to be fatal to the claims of the Confessional as an instrument for securing moral purity. In Quebec the morality of the Roman Catholics stands high: but the credit may be due as much to the absence of wealth and luxury among that simple peasantry as to the moral machinery of the Church, or even to the virtues, which are undeniable, of the local priesthood.

On the whole, then, it is better that the sanctity of marriage should repose on the moral reason of mankind and the interest of society as ascertained by experience than on ecclesiastical authority. Its basis, though less dogmatic, will not be the less religious, if behind moral reason and the interest of society there is the fiat of the Creator. In fact the interposition of ecclesiastical authority is likely to inflame rather than to repress license, since it presents the Moral Law as a legitimate object of attack, by identifying it with absurd or noxious superstitions. Marriage, according to the Church of Rome, rests on no better ground than the fantastic, or worse than fantastic, table of prohibited degrees; and to say this is to pronounce the doom of the institution. In truth with regard to this question, so vital to civilization and humanity, as with regard to many other points of the Moral Law, we are actually threatened with violent revolution as a consequence of the natural reaction against the irrational tyranny of the Church. No one can fail to see that the pamphlet of M. Dumas, for in-

stance, is, in its substance, as well as in its form, polemic, not social philosophy, and the writer is hurried into one extreme by antagonism to a clerical opponent who maintains the other. Regarded calmly, the question is one the difficulty of which almost equals its importance. On the one hand it certainly seems not only cruel, but injurious to the character of marriage, to hold two persons in unwilling union. On the other hand it seems certain that indissolubility contributes to the happiness of marriage as well as to its dignity, since it obliges the partners to accommodate themselves to each other and to seek a remedy for unpleasant friction by smoothing away the points of collision, not in a rupture. Many a union which in the end has proved full of happiness, both to the partners and their offspring, would have been hastily dissolved by some storm of passion if the feeling of the hour could have had its way. The cases generally brought forward to move us in favour of a change, are those of women bound to bad husbands: they are often heartrending, and incline us to legislative action of the most drastic kind; yet it can hardly be denied that on the whole the indissoluble character of marriage is an immense protection to the woman againt the wandering passions of the man. It is to be remembered that the same measure of liberty must be given to both sides, though this is frequently left out of sight by those who advocate freedom of divorce in the interest of the woman. M. Dumas labours hard to prove that the consequences of divorce to the children would not be so bad as we suppose: he may convince us that this consideration has been exaggerated, but he cannot convince us that it is not very serious. A young child would probably not suffer much in its feelings by the divorce of its parents: it suffers in its feelings, as M. Dumas remarks, only in a transient way by their death: but it can hardly fail to suffer greatly in its bringing up as well as from the want of a guide and protector on its going forth into the world. We do not forget that besides the law, there is opinion, which, if it remained sound, would restrain the exercise of legal liberty; yet among the less cultivated and

sensitive of mankind, opinion, unless it be sustained by law, though it may control taste, has not much force against passion. We have seen, at Utah, a whole community plunge into polygamy, and adapt its public sentiment to that monstrous institution, as soon as it got beyond the pale where monogamy was enforced. It will not do, in deciding this question, to be too much led by exceptional instances, affecting as they may be. After all, the great majority of marriages turn out well: if they do not attain the ideal of matrimony, they make the pair much happier than either would have been alone.

Each country in its turn will have to settle the question, as it will all other social questions, on the simple grounds of reason and the public good, irrespective alike of clerical authority and of anti-clerical declamation. As was said before, our views may cease to be ecclesiastical and yet they may remain religious, if the well-being of man, and the means by which it is attained, really emanate from God. The observation applies to a secondary question which seems in Canada, as elsewhere, to raise a storm out of proportion to its importance, that of Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister. Those who adhere to the ancient faith may in their private consciences consider the Levitical law still binding and govern their own actions accordingly: but it is vain to think that public institutions can long rest securely on this basis. For the mass of mankind they must be placed upon a more rational foundation than that of a document, which, however venerable, plainly belongs to the Tribal state and to the East. The dangerous weakness of the ecclesiastical argument is revealed when an Anglican bishop appeals to the testimony of the Church of Rome, and another clerical opponent of the change contends that if we cease to be bound by the special precepts of Leviticus we must plunge into unlimited incest. If the testimony of the Church of Rome is good for anything it proves the validity of the Roman table of prohibited degrees, which has been no doubt disregarded in numberless instances by the Protestants of the Bishop's diocese. If nothing but Leviticus stands between us and un-

limited incest, morality is in a bad way, as all who know anything about the history of the book must be aware: but marriages really incestuous are forbidden by considerations both physical and domestic, wholly independent of any Mosaic or ecclesiastical restriction. Is it better on the whole for society that marriage with a deceased wife's sister should be permitted or that it should be forbidden? That question will have to be answered after striking the balance between the practical arguments which, as no impartial judge can doubt, may be alleged upon both sides, by the voice of reason: and the voice of reason, rightly heard, is the voice of its Author.

—The coincidence between the fate of Jingoism in England and the crisis in Bismarck's fortunes, marked by his tender of resignation, may have been not purely accidental. Bismarck's militarism and his dark diplomacy have, perhaps, nearly had their day: they were useful in bringing about German union, throwing off the Austrian incubus, and foiling the jealousy of France. He apparently wants to force on consolidation faster than provincial feeling, strengthened by ages of political separation, will permit; he is now bullying Hamburg, and is in danger of awakening general jealousy by so doing. Probably his irritability and the arbitrariness of his temper are increased by a disorder caused by prodigious eating and drinking, combined with overwork. He has been a tremendous battering ram, but there is a limit to the functions of battering rams in a moral civilization.

It is again rumoured that he has his eye on Holland; but this is not likely: he has always abjured the incorporation of alien elements: he bluntly told the Alsatians that he wanted not them, but their country; and he could not lay his hand on Holland without firing the mine. Denmark is the more likely mark of his designs of aggrandizement, if he has any. Denmark is the natural seaboard of Germany, and it languishes itself, commercially, from being cut off from its continent. Its

isolation is also a source of great military danger: it is always inviting intervention or invasion, and in the last war it kept a German army employed in watching it. Its incorporation into the Bund must come.

—In Italy the appeal of the King and the Moderate Liberal Government to the country against the parliamentary anarchy by which the Government had been overthrown, appears to have resulted in the return of a multiplicity of discordant sections, by which the anarchy will probably be renewed. "Party discipline," remarks the New York *Nation*, "is still too weak in the Italian Parliament, and will continue to be until the voters punish members who desert their party, without some reasonable and openly definable excuse." Why, is not our excellent contemporary itself protesting against such enforcement of party discipline in its own country, and backing up the Scratchers who are trying to break the Conkling-Cameron Machine? The *Nation* itself says that the Italian Parliament has an incurable disease, to which it gives the name of "groups." No doubt the disease is incurable, for the obvious reason that where men use their brains about political questions, there will be not only two, but many different shades of opinion. You cannot make all the men on one side of a Legislative Hall think exactly alike, though by the method suggested by the *Nation* you may dragoon them all into voting alike, at the same time, eliminating, as you certainly will, independence and integrity from public life. The fundamental postulate of the Party System—that men are by nature permanently divided into two parties—is utterly false, and the political edifices built upon it are everywhere coming to the ground.

—Political Satire has appeared among us, in a dramatic form, though in the humble guise of an Imitation. It was in a dramatic form, so far as history reaches, that Political Satire

first appeared, and it at once attained an excellence which it has never attained in any form since. Beneath the rock of the Acropolis, amidst the glories of the Athenian art and the scenes of Athenian history, the most quickwitted, vivacious, laughter-loving, and at the same time the most inteusely political people that the world ever saw, met to witness the Comedies of Aristophanes. The characters in the drama were the public men and the intellectual leaders of the day, Cleon, Nicias, Demosthenes, Socrates, Euripides, whose well known features were represented by the masks which the performers wore. All of these figures were pecfectly familiar to the audience; for in the political assemblies of Athens there was no representation; every freeman appeared in person; every man was not merely a reader of political newspapers, but an active politician: the little city was the State and the personages travestied on the stage were to be seen every day upon the street, and in all the places of social resort. It was a time also of intense political excitement; a war was raging in Greece, between a group of States headed by Athens on one side and a group headed by Sparta on the other, which, as it was a conflict between aristocracy and democracy divided each state internally into parties and awakened all the passions of civil war; and so every citizen was a politician, so every citizen was a soldier. Party feeling at Athens was at fever heat, and the struggle in the Assembly between the factions and the clubs which were their organs in the Assembly, was little inferior in ferocity to that between the factions and the clubs of the French Revolutions. Such an audience will never meet again; such political or social conditions will never be reproduced. Nor is it very likely that we shall ever again see such an artist as Aristophanes. Greek literature and art, springing up at a bound into a perfection, which, in point of form at least, is still unapproached, are altogether a miracle, of which no part is more miraculous than the plays of Aristophanes. We wonder how his satire, at once so personal and so cutting, can have been endured by those whose keenest feelings and strongest interests

are attacked; and we wonder that, being endured, it did not produce a greater effect; that it did not ruin the popularity of Cleon. The solution of the first problem is to be found in the Athenian love both of art and fun, which asserted itself in the very throes of Revolution; perhaps also in the very tension of political feeling, which may have made the comic stage a welcome relief, as at Paris the theatres were crowded in the Reign of Terror. The solution of the second problem is to be found in the general impotence of personal satire, which we suspect has seldom done serious injury to any public man, while perhaps it has often given a harmless vent to the envy and jealousy which the ascendancy of a powerful leader is apt to beget even among his own party. We may perhaps acquit Aristophanes of having, by the most famous of his plays, actually helped to fill the cup of hemlock for Socrates.

In another respect the conditions under which political dramas flourished at Athens were such as cannot be reproduced. Though it was the most glorious age of art, it was the age before good manners. The habits of mutual respect and the sensitiveness as to reputation, which prevail in modern society, or in the better portion of it, hardly existed in the time and country of Aristophanes. The great orators of Greece, Demosthenes himself among the number, speaking on the grandest themes, abuse each other in language which the lowest journal of the present day would hardly admit to its editorial columns. There is no denying that the revival of the Satiric Drama in any hands but those of ancient genius restrained by modern taste and good breeding would be too likely to lead to personalities, which in our state of civilization would be offensive. It is on this account we presume more than on strictly political grounds, that in England, the Lord Chamberlain is still allowed to exercise a censorship over dramatic politics, as well as over dramatic morality. H. M. S. Parliament is perfectly good humoured; but the part relating to Sir Leonard Tilley, shows, to say the least, that there is a danger to be avcided.

—The Church returns to the Theatre. It is well. The drama is a liberal amusement; and to excommunicate it is to throw it into bad hands. But though the Church is right in returning to the Theatre, it was not so wrong in leaving it, as is imagined by certain people who wish to erect Art into a religion. Let those who revile the Puritans for closing the playhouse, and the Methodists for shunning it, read, we will not say the filth which Wycherley dedicated to the Duchess of Queensberry, but a single comedy of the superfine Congreve. There are playhouses now which ought to be shut up, and which not only Methodism but decency will shun; nay, there are exhibitions sometimes in respectable theatres under the name of Opera Bouffe, every performer in which deserves to be dragged through a horse pond, where he would meet nothing so filthy as himself. It is to be hoped that the renewal of the concordat with Religion will have the effect of a gentle censorship. The Theatre, however, after all is a public amusement, and it is as well to remember that there are some who shrink from public amusements, because life is to them too serious, perhaps too sad, for such enjoyments, and yet are not sour or morose, but, on the contrary, among the most sweet-tempered and beneficent of mankind.

—The Church of England has been once more marking her attitude towards the other Protestant churches, in the person of one of her Bishops, who has refused to attend a meeting of the Bible Society, because it was to be held in a Presbyterian place of worship. Her claim to this exclusive position rests on the supposed succession of Bishops lineally representing the Apostles; a belief which was expressed some time ago in a curiously realistic form by an English Prelate, who, being incensed by the irreverence of some opponent in a controversy, exclaimed that he felt the blood of the Apostles boiling in his veins. It is needless to say what critical historians think about the alleged evidences of the existence of

Episcopacy in its present form during the first two centuries, and the possibility of tracing the spiritual pedigree which connects Alexander Borgia, Dubois, Gardiner, Bonner, and Sheldon with the founders of a religion of freedom, light, and love. But supposing the belief in Apostolical Succession to be well-founded, and the bishops to be the divinely appointed keepers of Christian truth, what is the position of the Church of England? By the bishops of the Roman and Greek Churches, who are an immense majority of the order, she is regarded as heretical, and excluded from communion. The Greek Bishops barely acknowledge her existence as a church; the Roman Bishops refuse to acknowledge it at all, and would treat Bishop Sweatman as a lay heretic, and nothing more. Either, then, the Church of England is in deadly error, or by falsely affirming that she is in deadly error, the immense majority of the Bishops prove that Apostolical Succession, in their persons, is no guarantee for truth. At the accession of Elizabeth, the Anglican Episcopacy depended for its existence on one holder of a see who conformed to the Revolution, and the few survivors of the extruded and exiled Protestant Bishops of the preceding reign. The true Christian tradition must then have hung by a very slender thread, which would have snapped altogether had Mary lived long enough for the extruded Bishops to die out. Before these ecclesiastical figments were invented, Christianity, by its spiritual force, had won the ancient world: since their invention it has almost lost the modern world. The exclusive pretensions of the Church of England in this country are however, at bottom, probably as much social as ecclesiastical: they are a continuation of the feelings of the English gentry towards Dissenters. The Christian religion, we repeat, has a heavy load to bear. Can its bitterest assailant pretend to believe that Anglican isolation is an outcome of the Gospel, or that a moral representative of the Apostles would have refused communion with his fellow Christians, on a point of church government? It would be as easy to prove that St.

Paul claimed the title of "My Lord." In a brave discourse the President of Victoria College has said that "the answer to the question, Is Christianity true? must depend upon a better and more harmonious answer to the question, What is Christianity?" To arrive at the answer to the second question, again, we shall have to look beneath a vast superincumbent heap of adventitious matter, including the pretensions, hierarchical and social, of Christians who abjure communion with Dissenters. Nor is the time allowed for this difficult process very long. Atheism is at the gates, while Christians are fighting about Apostolical Succession, and even about the proper posture for the Bishop at Confirmation!

—If Col. Ingersoll does not win converts, he calls forth innumerable replies which perhaps answer his purpose as well. Canada contributes a refutation of his lectures by "A Rationalist," though the writer appears, by his method of spiritualizing the Old Testament, and thus removing the stumbling blocks which it presents when construed literally, to be not so much a Rationalist as a Swedenborgian. Canada in Chicago (and in Chicago and the whole of that region there is a Canada indeed) contributes a little volume of lectures on the Evidences of Christianity, the writer of which, Mr. Gibson, evidently has Col. Ingersoll in his eye. With regard to the "Mistakes of Moses," to which "A Rationalist" devotes part of his apology, we may, possibly, say a few words when political events do not crowd our limited space as they do at present. Reasons may perhaps be given for thinking, at all events, that those who have accepted the Old Testament as an element of their spiritual life, have neither been idiots nor destitute of moral sense. We must here be content with remarking, in reference to the other branch of the controversy, that if the Theistic theory requires restatement, as we should be the last to deny that it does, in view of the recent results of Criticism and Science, the Materialistic hypothesis is not free from difficulty. Professor Tyndall tells us that "Mat-

ter contains the promise and potency of all terrestrial life." But turning to Professor Tyndall's essays, we find that Matter has a partner, "Force," whose presence appears just as essential to the existence of the promise and potency as that of Matter. Which of the two is the First Principle? Force cannot have been produced by Matter, because without Force Matter cannot move, change, or generate at all. Matter cannot have been produced by Force, because Force is nothing but the impulsion of Matter. Apparently there must have been something before both which produced them and determined their relations; and it must be something beyond the range of Sense. Let it be observed that this indication, if it be real, is not merely negative, nor is its legitimate result Agnosticism; it points, according to the principles of Science herself to the existence of some active and creative power not cognizable by our bodily senses, and therefore not material, matter being that which is cognizable by the bodily sense, as all Physical Science is merely the sum of the perceptions of our bodily senses recorded and reduced to method. The assumption not only of the provisional truth, but of the exhaustive and final authority, of the human nerves of sight, hearing, touch, taste and smell, seems to be the foundation of the Materialistic hypothesis, while it is not clear on what that assumption itself rests. It is in fact contrary to reason, ince our senses collectively present the universe as finite, while nothing in mathematics is more certainly demonstrable than Infinity. But these thoughts bring us into a region where the clap-trap of the platform, and the applause which greets it are little grateful to the ear.

Mr. Gibson of course deals with the question of miracles. The *a priori* reasonings in this controversy on both sides are most unfruitful. We are told that miracles can never have taken place because they would be violations of the laws of the universe. By "universe" is meant a point in Infinity, and a moment in Eternity, for nothing more falls under our observation. But Law is a Theistic term: it always implies a lawgiver: Physical Science can tell us only of general facts. If

there are laws, they are the modes of the Creator's general action; and how can the modes of His general action be a bar to his special action in any particular case? It is equally futile to demonstrate the possibility of miracles. The question is one entirely of evidence. We must have eye witnesses, many and good; as many and as good as we should require if asked to believe in the restoration of sight to the blind or the raising of the dead at the present day. Can such testimony be produced? If it can, prejudice alone will refuse to believe: if it cannot, there is no use in falling back on faith, which is belief in things unseen, not in things imperfectly proved. Mr. Gibson, like some other modern apologists, seems inclined to drop certain miracles, such as that of the Swine and that of the Fig Tree; but he must remember that the evidence for these is precisely the same as for those which he wishes to preserve. If it is insufficient in one case it is insufficient in all.

—The Positivists say that Theology is dying: but interest in Theology is not. Among a number of books on what appears to be almost the engrossing subject, we have before us the third edition of Mr. Jellett's Donnellan Lectures on the "Efficacy of Prayer," treating the subject philosophically, and we should say in a liberal and charitable spirit, with a desire to satisfy and not merely to confute. The strange Prayer Test of Professor Tyndall, or rather of some one whose proposal Professor Tyndall submitted to the public, hardly calls for examination: only an exclusive physicist could imagine that any one took Prayer for a force such as is capable of being tested by the methods of physical experiment. How much reason would there be in submitting even human supplication to such a test? Yet men are moved by supplication, and those of settled character perhaps not less than others, if certain moral conditions are fulfilled by the suppliant. On the other hand, it is perhaps not likely that any man of sense would be moved by the repetition of formularies. Christianity has a heavy load to bear; it is like a medicine expected to work its

healing effect when mixed with alien and even poisonous ingredients. That which is attacked as Christianity is not the Gospel, pure and simple, but the Gospel with the accretions of Constantinople, Alexandria, Rome, Barbarism, Monachism, and with other spurious growths of eighteen centuries. The Founder of Christianity taught His disciples a short and simple prayer within the narrow compass of which lies proof sufficient of the unique character of His religion. The only physical petition which this prayer contains is, "Give us this day our daily bread"—scarcely more than a general acknowledgment of sustaining providence. The Teacher can hardly be held responsible for the practices which science derides, any more than for our long liturgies with their vain repetitions, or our prayers and thanksgivings for victory over fellow-Christians in war.

—A paper in the *North American Review* on "The Religion of all Sensible Men," by Leslie Stephen, excites our expectation, as everything from his pen on such a subject would; but it is a disappointment. It only tells us that upon the question to which it relates the mind of a man of intellect, devoted to philosophy, and living in the centre of thought, is a perfect blank: he has evidently not formed the faintest notion what the religion of the future will be, or whether the future will have a religion at all. This in its way perhaps is instructive: we are warned of the quarter to which it is vain to look. Europe, with her critical learning, has done the work of demolition; but perhaps that very learning, or the habits of mind connected with it, may prevent her from doing the work of construction. Apparently, if the new faith is going to be a religion, in the proper sense of the term, there must be in it an element which no learning or science can supply, but which must be the outcome of moral and spiritual effort such as gave birth to Christianity. "Can any good come out of Galilee?" was the natural and rational reflection of a superior and learned Jew living in the midst of the Judaic culture. Can any good come

from people who are imperfectly acquainted with Berkeley and Jonathan Edwards? is the equally natural and rational reflection of Mr. Leslie Stephen, though he writes in the most genial sprit and with the kindest toleration of the blind strivings of ignorance to arrive at truth. "What shall we do to be saved?" is a problem which is as likely to be solved by the craving heart and struggling conscience of a Galilean as by the intellect of a great Doctor of the Law. Assuming that there is to be a revival of religion, if we were asked to fix upon its probable scene, we should be inclined to name, not London, Paris, or Berlin, but some Galilee of the Far West.

—The character of Hamlet has hitherto been an enigma; but the solution is found at last. A writer in a scientific periodical has discovered that the real key to the mystery is "the impediment of adipose." Hamlet was dreadfully fat: his obesity fatally interfered with his energy, and prevented him from carrying his resolutions into effect. This, though the unscientific world has never dreamed of it, and may be rather taken aback by it, is the explanation at last brought to light by science. "He's fat and scant of breath,"— those words are the keynote. Hamlet's wish that his "too, too solid flesh would melt," is to be taken literally and physically. So is his expression, "to grunt and sweat under a weary life." Again that phrase, "while memory holds a seat in this distracted globe" is it not suggestive of a rotund and corpulent person? Our physicist thinks it clearly is; and he finds confirmation in the sentence, "Sir, I will walk here in the hall; if it please his majesty, this is the breathing time of day with me." "He's fat and scant of breath" is said by the Queen in the fencing scene at the very end of the play, and a moment before the catastrophe. It is not likely that such an artist as Shakespeare would keep back the keynote of a character till the character had played its part. "Fat" probably means nothing more than out of training: at any rate it is ridiculous

to suppose that Shakespeare means to dwell on Hamlet's corpulence. Surely the appearance of such a theory in a leading organ of Science is a proof that ultra-physicism is abroad, and that we had better be on our guard against it. Not a little of the philosophy of history that is now published is of the same character as this explanation of the character of Hamlet. Mr. Buckle would have confidently resolved Shakespeare himself into beef and ale.

At the end of the first half-year of its existence, THE BYSTANDER finds its circulation treble of that on which its founders calculated, and still increasing. We do not take this as a proof of agreement with our opinions, but we hope we may take it as a proof that independent journalism is in favour, and that THE BYSTANDER is believed to be independent.

THE BYSTANDER.

JULY, 1880.

THE great question before the mind of the people of Canada is, and till it is settled will continue to be, that between the Continental and Anti-Continental policy, in its bearing on our commercial relations and our public works. Opinion is moving, and moving fast, as appears from the altered tone of Anti-Continental organs, which a few years, and even a few months ago, thought it safe to indulge in ridicule, but now find themselves compelled to treat the subject as extremely serious, and even occasionally to use the unfamiliar language of decency towards opponents. They have yet another step to take in this case as in the case of the Reform of the Senate. Freedom of thought and discussion respecting the vital interests and future destinies of the nation has at least been asserted. The victory is not one of which men of English race need be very proud; but at all events it has been gained, and not an hour too soon. "Let well alone," cries the Montreal *Journal of Commerce*.* Well for whom? For the knights or the country? Has not the *Journal of Commerce* itself told us that Canada is "piling up debt," that "she is drifting into bankruptcy," that her day of reckoning is near? The Anti-Continentalists they are who have forced the discussion on us, by pushing forward Anti-

* The *Journal of Commerce* upbraids the BYSTANDER with violating the rule of impersonality in journalism. We think the rule a good one, though we have no special interest in it; and we invariably observe it towards all who observe it towards us. Sir Francis Hincks must be aware that he has not observed it towards us.

Continental works, railways and canals, which, unless the general policy to which they belong is sound, must evidently be our ruin. A community "drifting into bankruptcy" is surely called upon, in the most urgent manner, to look about it and see whether it is on the right track, especially if it perceives that it is being drawn in a dangerous direction, not only by the tendencies of its statesmen, but by the interests of a great body of contractors and contract-mongers who are every day weaving their net around it, and who are sure to carry off great fortunes in whatever plight they may leave the people. If any one is an unscrupulous Annexationist, let him support a policy of ambitious and chimerical expenditure, such as that on which we are now embarking. Bankruptcy will assuredly lead to Annexation in the most ignominious sense of the term; not to an equal and honourable union, such as a nation still flourishing might command, but to a compulsory annexation on American terms.

We are not reflecting on the Government. The Government is merely doing, perhaps with greater energy and ability, what was done by the Government before it. All our public men are pretty much in the same boat, and none of them need specially fear the charge of inconsistency if he now does what is best for the country.

The present state of the case, as it appears to us, is truly described by a very homely phrase—the bottom has fallen out of the Anti-Continental policy. Its mainstay, and the source of its life, British Jingoism, is no more: Sir Alexander Galt finds himself in the position of ambassador to an extinct power, and goes about with his military attaché like a man who has arrived in a striking costume a day too late for the fancy ball. The Anti-Continental system of Separatist railways is practically coming to nothing. By the virtual abandonment of the line to the north of Lake Superior, and the acquiescence of the Government in the American route between Duluth and Sault Ste. Marie, the continuity of the Pacific Railway as a military and political road is fatally broken, and the Imperial under-

taking falls to the ground, leaving nothing but a road-building and land-selling speculation in a territory not conterminous with Canada, which may be very good for contractors and land speculators but is nothing to the Empire. So far from fostering the ends of the Anti-Continental policy, the Pacific Railway, or rather the connection formed by it, is likely to defeat them, since it will identify the Dominion with territories inextricably interlaced, geographically and commercially, with the United States. The Intercolonial, which was to form the eastern wing of the Anti-Continental system, is not likely ever to pay a cent on its capital, even if it pays its running expenses, which the best judges do not believe it will; while the highest military authorities pronounce it useless for its Imperial object. The people, whom it is the aim of the Anti-Continentalist to estrange and separate for ever from the United States, are streaming into the United States by thousands, driven from their homes by the commercial consequences of the Anti-Continental policy itself. The St. John *Sun*, confirming our account of the exodus from that district, adds, as the result of its own inquiry, that a battalion of militia lost 166 men out of 250 between the time of the visit of the Governor-General and the Princess and the late anniversary of the Queen's birthday, and had to call for 166 recruits to fill the places of the young men who had gone away, mainly to the United States. From Quebec, Nova Scotia, and Ontario itself, the exodus is alarming, and it appears that, even in the case of Ontario, the majority of the departures are for the United States. Were it not for this depletion, discontent would be likely to come to a formidable head. In commerce, in ownership of railways, in everything, the barrier between the nations is giving way. Canadian silver circulates across the line: American paper currency circulates in Canada; unless Sir L. Tilley takes care it will circulate better than that which he has based upon his debt. If things go on at this rate, before the works which, at an enormous cost, are to prevent fusion can be completed, fusion will have actually taken place.

The North-West itself, which was to be the grand rampart of Separatism, will probably be the first scene of union, because in that region there is a very mixed population, without any old antipathy or any real dividing line.* In finance, Anti-Continentalism has arrived at an inflation of the currency. In spite of the temporary revival of trade, caused by the good harvest and high prices of last year, voices of distress and anxiety are heard on all sides. The people are fast getting into a mood in which they will not bear another English loan.

Newfoundland scans our condition and emphatically declines to join the Confederation. She is nearer to us in every sense than British Columbia. Even among the Provinces within the Confederation revivals of Anti-Confederation sentiment are

---

* On the other hand, there were reasons which, not only to patriotic Canadians, but to the patriotic Americans who took a comprehensive view of the interests of the country, seemed strong, for wishing that Canada should remain politically separate from the United States. Democracy is a great experiment, which might be more safely carried on by two nations than by one. By emulation, mutual warning and correction, mutual supplementation of defects, they might have helped each other in the race, and steadied each other's steps; a balance of opinion might have been established on the continent, though a balance of power cannot; and the wave of dominant sentiment which spreads over that vast democracy like the tide running in over a flat, might have been usefully restricted in its sweep by the dividing line. Nor was there any insurmountable obstacle in the way. Canada is wanting in unity of race; but not more so than Switzerland, whose three races have been thoroughly welded together by the force of nationality. She is wanting in compactness of territory, but not more so, perhaps, than some other nations—Prussia, for instance—have been. In this latter respect, however, the situation has been seriously altered by the annexation of Manitoba and British Columbia, which in their raw condition have no influence beyond that of distant possessions, but which, when peopled and awakened to commercial life, will be almost irresistibly attracted by the economical forces to the States which adjoin them on the south, and will thus endanger the cohesion of the whole Confederacy. The very form of the Dominion, indeed, drawn out and attenuated as it is by these unnatural additions, apart from the attractive influence of Minnesota and California, would seriously imperil its political unity, as will be seen, if, instead of taking Canada as it is presented by the political map, the boundary-line is drawn between the habitable portion and that which belongs only to Arctic frosts. In the debate on Confederation, it was urged by the advocates of the measure that seven sticks, though separately weak, when bound together in a faggot would be strong. "Yes," was the reply, "but not so seven fishing-rods tied together by the ends."—*Political Destiny of Canada*, page 62. This passage was written some years ago, but the course of events has not yet shewn that the writer was mistaken.

perceptible, and rifts in the edifice begin to open. Prosperity unites but adversity disunites, and its disruptive influence is already seen. The Nova Scotia Correspondent of the *Globe* says—"He would be an unfaithful chronicler of our current events who, writing from Nova Scotia at present, could ignore the fact that there is a very large element of dissatisfaction, which rises above the conflict of political parties, and strikes at the Constitution itself. In city and country, from all parts of the Province, one hears of a sentiment which is expressed in the significant word 'Repeal.' At no time during the past decade was that ominous word on so many lips as now. It cannot be said that this is the result of agitation, for there has been no agitation. There is no repeal movement. There are no repeal leaders. And yet repeal—secession would be a more correct term, perhaps, but I use the word I hear—is talked of in all quarters as a most desirable thing. Nova Scotia, evidently, is sick and tired of Confederation, and if we had a political leader of recognized character and ability who could take up the repeal cause, forsaking all others and cleaving to that alone, he would speedily create a large party and a powerful movement." The correspondent then speaks of the unparalleled exodus, and says that the Province has not even the small consolation of thinking that the emigrants go to the North-West, the fact being that five out of six go to the United States. If this is not the handwriting on the wall of a domnant Policy, what is?

The North-West is a land of promise, and its progress appears to be rapid,* though, judging from all experience, we should think that it would advance not less rapidly if it were left to be opened up in the natural way, without the sinister influences which wait on Government operations, and if its railways were laid down on commercial, not on political, lines. The construction of a railway in it may possibly be a very good specula-

* In one respect it is astonishingly rapid; for there is already a newspaper (*The Winnipeg Free Press*), which, typographically speaking, presents at least as fine a sheet as any in the Dominion.

tion for Canada, as might be the construction of a railway, supposing she chose to undertake it, in Minnesota or Dakota. Minnesota and Dakota are practically just as much connected with her as a Province nominally hers, to which she has not, and is not likely ever to have, access by land except over foreign territory. It is not calling a district Canadian that will make it so, whatever the political theory may be. A good speculation the railway in the prairie region may prove, provided its balance sheet is not spoiled by making it carry works in British Columbia. The immediate consequences to Canada, however, are the loss of many of her best farmers, and the depreciation of her farms, which have fallen in value twenty-five per cent., with the prospect of still further reduction by competition with the boundless harvests of the North-West. Had this come in the course of nature, cheerful acquiesence would have been our duty, but it is rather hard that Canada should be made by her politicians to run into debt for her own impoverishment and depopulation.

Knowledge grows. The journal which, not three months ago, was denouncing as traitors and knaves all who were opposed to the construction of the British Columbia portion of the Pacific Railway, has now to publish such a paragraph as this:—

"An engineer, who is a Conservative, writing from British Columbia to a contractor here, states that along the one hundred and twenty-seven miles of railroad recently let by contract in the Pacific Province, there is not fertile land enough to produce food for the staff which will have to be employed in working the road when constructed. He characterizes the sections let as beginning nowhere and ending nowhere, and states that in several places workmen will have to be suspended by ropes over the cliffs in order to pick standing room in the smooth face of the rock along which the line will have to be cut. He further states that the population along the projected route consists purely of a few broken-down miners, relics of the gold fever, all of whom expect to be employees on the road."

—It is announced that Sir Alexander Galt offers to advance the passages of workmen for the Pacific Railway, and that the

Government will find employment for three thousand of them for six years. This is good news for the English labour market, and good news for the steamship companies. Canada will have to lay out in passage money a large sum, the recovery of which experience shows will be difficult, especially as the men will be strongly tempted to straggle over to the States, while if many bring their families with them, she may have to relieve a good deal of temporary destitution. Hardly any benefit can accrue to our existing population. The jealousy of our own labouring classes, indeed, is being aroused by this policy, and it is likely that they will make themselves heard on the subject before long. They know that they have no interest in the special objects of our politicians. In fact they begin, like their brethren elsewhere, to care less for political or even national objects of any kind, and more for the interests of Industry throughout the world.

With respect to emigration generally, Sir A. Galt must have been made sensible of the fact that the Anti-Continental policy never had any solid basis. The British emigrant is, and always has been, almost indifferent as to the flag of the country to which he goes. Of course, he chooses the country of an English-speaking race, but he thinks very little more about the flag than about the name of the vessel in which he sails. Bread for himself and his children is what he seeks, and he will seek it as readily in Texas as in Canada. It is not that he does not care for England, but he does not care for a dependency, which to him is just as foreign as the States. Nor is this sentiment, or absence of sentiment, confined to peasants and mechanics. If there is a true Englishman living, it is the author of "Tom Brown." Yet when he wants to build up a colony for the special benefit of English youth, where does he choose his site? He chooses it in Tennessee. On the other hand, all men of English race know perfectly well, in spite of the sermons preached to them by Anti-Continental journals every morning, that they are united to their Mother Country by a bond of the heart, the existence of which depends not on any customs line, nor even

upon any political arrangement. None love England better than Canadians actually resident in the States; we might perhaps add, than many of the Americans themselves; for in the American breast the natural feeling towards the Mother Country, though it has been hidden by resentment and jealousy, has never died.

The unity of the English-speaking race is an idea which is more and more embodying itself in practical forms, as kindly intercourse between England and the United States increases, and as the memory of the old quarrel fades away into the past. It will gain strength greatly from the recovered ascendency of Liberalism in England. Gradually it will be seen that while a political federation of the Empire is impracticable, there is no reason for despairing of a moral federation, which shall include, instead of excluding, the fifty millions of English-speaking people who share with us this continent. With this idea is linked a sentiment which will redeem the Continental policy from being what it has been graciously styled, a policy of hogs, and which can hardly fail to outlast the U. E. Loyalist antipathy to what is now the majority of our race—an antipathy as respectable in its origin as any antipathy can be, but, like all antipathies, doomed to die.

—We are constantly told that the removal of the customs line must precipitate us into the Union. Take away the identity of race, language, religion, fundamental institutions, commercial interest, and you may, without any fear of fusion, remove the customs line. History proves that nations can live without a customs line, not only separate, but on the most satisfactory footing of mutual hatred. But you cannot take away that identity; and its influence will more and more prevail. There was one thing which might have counteracted the attraction, and that was Canadian nationality. It is needless to say how Canadian nationality, when it showed its head, was treated by those who are now in such alarm at the danger which is the natural result of its suppression.

After all, have not those who shriek against Commercial Union themselves been doing their utmost to bring about Reciprocity? And what is Commercial Union but Reciprocity made complete instead of incomplete, and lasting instead of unstable? Would there be any saving virtue in the mere existence of a customs line, with its annoyances and delays, when commercial intercourse had been made practically free?

We are perfectly aware that our views are controverted, and we desire to speak with all possible respect for those of our opponents which, in the main, have been in possession of the public mind, though partly, we are persuaded, owing to a conventional tyranny of sentiment which has precluded free discussion. Nor do we profess to be at all sanguine as to the immediate issue of the debate. If the people could vote upon this question under the protection of the ballot, the result would astonish our politicians; such, at least, is the opinion of some well qualified to judge, and the vote of 1878, rightly interpreted, proves that the masses are beginning to think of their material interests, and to prefer them to party ties. But power is in the hands of the politicians, and the politicians, with few exceptions, have been bred in the Anti-Continental School. The leading men among them look for their highest honours, and their social distinctions not to Canada, but to England, that is, in fact, to the English aristocracy, which, in desiring to maintain a counterpoise to democracy on this continent, merely obeys the instinct of self-preservation. Both parties in this respect have been the same: it was not the Tory chief that founded the Kingston Military College, and gave the late Governor-General liberty to draw as he pleased on the public for his tours of Anti-Continental propagandism. Even politicians, who speak with perfect freedom in private, return in public to the conventional strain. The probability is, that the Anti-Continental policy will be pursued till it has led us through bankruptcy to the verge of compulsory annexation. Then, as when the desperate strife of factions had brought the national affairs to a deadlock and Confederation became the only escape, we shall hear that there is to be a change of scene, and that

the leader of the Government has called upon the leader of the Opposition. Still, the duty of an honest journalist is clear: it is his business, so far as he has the power, to place the question of the day fairly and frankly before the people.

—There has been a very sudden conversion on the subject of the Senate. The late Managing Director of the *Globe* was a Senator. While he lived, we could not touch the sacred and invaluable institution without having the slop-pail emptied on our heads. He being dead, the *Globe* comes out with a series of articles demonstrating the absurdity of its former arguments, and advocating total abolition. Its Reform consort, however, the Montreal *Herald*, refuses to follow suit, and still defends the Senate. It is a canon of inductive logic, as expounded by Mr. Mill, that "If an instance in which the phenomenon under investigation occurs, and an instance in which it does not occur, had every circumstance in common save one, that one occurring only in the former, the circumstance in which alone the two instances differ, is the effect or the cause, or an indispensable part of the cause of the phenomenon." Perhaps science will uphold us in saying, that, in the present instance, the circumstance is an indispensable part of the cause.

The *Globe*, in spinning round, does the objects of its recent vituperation the honour to adopt not only their general line, but their special reasonings. That the analogy between the British House of Lords and the Upper Houses, which are supposed to be counterparts of it, is false; that builders of constitutions generally have been led astray by that fancy; that the House of Lords is not a Senate, but a feudal estate of the realm, embodying and maintaining the interest of a territorial aristocracy; that it has always acted in that interest, and never as a court of legislative revision, tempering the rash impulses of the Lower House; that in the absence of a territorial aristocracy there are no special materials for the composition of an Upper House; that, if you put the best men into it, you will

deprive the popular Chamber of its indispensable leaders and controllers, while, if you fill it with the old or the rich, you will make it impotent or odious; that, when nominated by the Crown, it is a nullity, and, when elected, is almost certain to come into collision with the other House, as it is now doing in some of the Australian colonies; that the sense of responsibility in the Lower House is apt to be reduced in full proportion to the controlling influence exercised by the Upper; that the proper checks on hasty legislation, and the proper security for Conservative influence generally are to be found, rather in wisely regulating the mode of election to the Assembly, so as to keep it in harmony with current opinion, yet superior to transient impulse, and in framing cautious rules for the conduct of business, including, perhaps, one which would give to a large minority the power of suspending for a limited time the passing of a law—are propositions familiar enough to the readers of the *Bystander* and of certain papers in the *Canadian Monthly*. What, it must be owned, is entirely original is the *Globe's* plan for terminating painlessly the existence of the Senate. The *Globe* proposes that sentence of death shall be passed, but that the execution shall be deferred, and that in the meantime the appointments shall be given to very old men. A notable device, to place the legislation of the country for a decade or so in the hands of decrepitude, with a rope rounds its neck, and acting under the combined inspiration of dotage and despair! We cannot help thinking that extinction by chloroform would be equally humane and attended with less inconvenience to the public.

That the appointments have passed from the hands of the Grits into those of the Tories is a consideration evidently present to the minds of certain publicists; but it appears to us totally irrelevant. The Tory nominations have been of exactly the same character as the Grit, both being of the only kind which, under the party system, we can possibly expect. Nor has the Dominion Senate done anything of late to merit special condemnation, though the Quebec Senate, in refusing the sup-

plies for a party purpose, revealed the possibilities of mischief which lurk beneath the general nullity of the institution.

What is wanted, if it were possible to obtain it, is not a faction fight over the abolition of the Senate, but a deliberate and impartial revision of our political experiment, as a whole. An experiment in the full sense of the term, it is. The talismanic phrase "principles of the British Constitution" is introduced upon every occasion, and people fancy that it settles all questions and solves all difficulties. But our Constitution is not British; we have no peerage or established church, while we have a federal element which the British Constitution has not, and which, as we have seen in the Letellier case, presents problems peculiar to itself. Moreover, the structure of society, to which all politics must be adapted, is different here and in England: among other things, Canada has no group of political families by which, in the absence of a written constitution, traditional principles can be preserved: the Conservative elements, therefore, must be looked for in another direction. But these calm processes of inquiry and readjustment are impossible under the party system. There will be once more a "tug of war," and muscle will decide whether we are to have one House or two.

It is an important question, this of the Senate; it is far more important than any connected with the mere details of our electoral machinery; but it is not the most important question of all. The most important question of all, and the one on which the new Opposition will have to take a clear and resolute line, if it means to succeed better than the last, is that of commercial relations and public works.

—Many readers of the newspapers must wish that N. and P. had been left out of the alphabet. But, as the controversy continues, it is necessary still to bear in mind that in the new tariff there are two elements, the increase of taxation and its adjustment. As to the first, there is no room for debate: there was a deficit to be filled and nobody has suggested any other

way of filling it than an increase of the import duties. As to the second, there is of course room for debate, but, so far as we can learn, those who are most competent to judge regard the new system as in this respect more beneficial to Canadian industry than the old. It is hardly possible that it should not be so. Of course, it is adapted, as every tariff must be, to the general policy of the county in regard to external relations, which many of us believe might be altered for the better; but for this its framers are not to blame. To allow Canada to be made a slaughter-market was, in any case, impolitic and wrong, nor shall we fare the worse, in any future negotiations with the United States, because justice has been done by our government to our own industries in the meantime.

The best accounts we can obtain of the state of trade point to a doubtful condition of things, with hope inspired by the new tariff on the one side, and misgivings as to the future on the other. In a few months we shall know whether the optimists or the pessimists are in the right. Wages do not seem to have increased; the price of real property, which after all, perhaps, is the ultimate index, is low, and to sell it is very difficult, as all those upon whose hands it is thrown are aware. Upon one point the utterances of our informants are not ambiguous. They have no doubt as to the danger of over-importation, stimulated by large borrowing abroad, especially with the fatal facility of credit naturally produced by the results of overproduction in England. To create a delusive prosperity, which is followed by a proportionate reaction in after years, is the deadly attribute of public loans, and makes the system, in the hands of weak or unscrupulous governments, doubly perilous to the community.

—The cry of the banks is, "too much money." Yet this unhappily is the moment at which the government commences the inflation of the currency. We hope it is compatible with entire respect for the character and abilities of Sir Leonard Tilley to believe,

that his forced loan—for a forced loan and nothing else we repeat it is—will prove in the end the most expensive, as well as the most demoralizing, mode of borrowing. We appeal to the experience of all attempts of governments, under whatever form or disguise, to gain money by tampering with the currency.

Of course we do not expect Sir Leonard Tilley, in the present state of opinion on this subject, to abstain from "regulating the currency" altogether. We know that our view is not the established one. We hold, however, that the proper duty of a government is to put its stamp upon the coin, and that it is very doubtful whether it can with advantage to the community do anything more. Bank bills are not money; they are not substitutes for gold and silver any more than they are gold and silver: they are drafts for gold and silver, payable on demand. Like bills of exchange, promissory notes, and cheques, they are instruments of commercial transactions, the actual number and amount of which alone can properly regulate the issue. A government, it seems to us, might as well undertake to regulate in advance the number of bills of exchange, promissory notes, and cheques as the number of bank bills. The current necessities of commerce are the only true index in either case, and the current necessities of commerce can be determined only by commerce itself. Make the banking laws as strict as you like, impose penalties as severe as you like for any breach of the law; give the public every possible protection against what is unquestionably an exceptional danger; but this having been done, the banks will be better judges of the requirements of commerce, and better regulators of the amount of bank bills to be issued than any government. It is said that a gain accrues from issuing bank bills which had better go to the government than to the banks. But why does this apply to the profits of banking more than to those of any other trade? If the government is the community, it cannot gain by anything by which the community loses; and there is nothing by which a commercial community loses so much as by tampering with the currency, which is to it what the poisoning of his blood is to a

man. A government issuing paper currency is a bank naming its own reserve, changing the amount at will, and exempting itself from all penalties. How the privilege has been used is written in the most disastrous pages of financial history.

In England there is no reason to fear that the government will inflate the currency for any bad purpose; public morality is too firmly established, and commercial opinion is too strong. But it is still problematical, to say the least, whether the famous attempt to regulate the paper currency by the Bank Charter Act has been successful. Evidently one of the effects of the Act is to cause, at periods of disturbance, a sort of hysterical contraction which aggravates the evil, and has thrice rendered necessary a suspension of the Act. The distress caused by a number of bank failures was the occasion of this legislation; but it is doubtful whether an amendment of the banking law, taking greater securities and imposing heavier penalties, would not have been the wiser course. It must be remembered that there are still a great many private banks of issue in England, though the establishment of any new bank of issue is prohibited by the Act; so that the results of the Bank Charter Act are seen only in a very modified form.

Our National Currency friends continue to pepper us with paper pellets, which we are far too sensible of the gravity of the question to return. A serious derangement of the currency would fill the land with ruin; those who would suffer most by it would be the receivers of wages; those who would gain would be the sharks of the gold room. We will content ourselves with once more calling the attention of our friends to the fundamental fact that nothing ever has been or can be bought with paper, or with the words inscribed upon it. All trade not only was originally barter but still is so. We do not barter three sheep for an ox, like our primeval sires, but we barter an amount of gold equivalent in real value, though one element of that value is a privilege of acting as the world's money conferred by the immemorial, general, and now irreversible agreement of mankind. The receiver of the gold perhaps barters it for an ox.

If a bank bill is used, it is like a cheque, a draft or security for the gold, and nothing more; and you can no more multiply money by multiplying drafts for it, than you can multiply sheep and oxen. These are flagrant truisms, we know, but the Greenback party in the States and the National Currency party here are based upon the contrary supposition.

We have not denied that a government can, in a certain sense, "legislate value into paper." If a law is passed enabling the holder of stamped paper to force it upon his creditors, instead of paying them the gold which he has borrowed of them, of course the paper will to that extent have a value, though the government, as we humbly conceive, will have none. To cite the case of postage stamps as a precedent for paper money surely shows a strange confusion of ideas. What is a postage stamp but a receipt for so many cents which have been paid to the government in gold, and for which the government undertakes to convey the letter to which the receipt is affixed?

—It is the duty of the Opposition press to cast doubts on the *bonâ fide* character of the Commission of Inquiry into the Civil Service. For ourselves, we have no misgiving. In the appointment of judges Sir John Macdonald has always been loyal to the public interest, and to his upright exercise of the prerogative in this respect, we owe, in no small measure, the blessing of a trustworthy judiciary, which is a set-off against many political evils. There is no reason to doubt that he would show the same spirit in other appointments; but he is not his own master. Party reigns and insists on thrusting a wire-puller into one office and a rib-stabber into another, reckless of the just claims of those who have spent their lives in the service. Even selfish considerations would strongly incline a Prime Minister to Civil Service Reform. To him the minor patronage is an insufferable nuisance; it exposes him daily to every kind of personal embarassment and annoyance. The desire of Ministers to disencumber themselves of the petty patronage was a main cause of the

adoption of the Civil Service Reform, and of the introduction of the competitive, system in England. We feel pretty confident that the inquiry will be followed up by an effective measure of reform. For our own part we cannot say that we are extreme purists in this matter or fanatical advocates of competitive examination, though we have heard so good a judge as the late Lord Lawrence speak in the most decided terms of the success of the system as applied to India, where the demand for practical ability and energy is as great as possible. The essential things are that the public service shall be the public service, and not a party bribery fund, and that the appointments to the higher posts shall be made in the service, and as the rewards of administrative capacity and tried fidelity, not turned into pensions for wire-pullers and rib-stabbers outside.

It is right to say, on the other hand, that the names of the Commissioners have not been received with much favour either by the Service or by the public. These Commissions should be appointed when Parliament is sitting, and the names should be communicated, so that opportunity may be afforded for discussion. If this remark applies to the Civil Service Commission, the object of which is merely to prepare for the Government the materials of legislation, it applies to the Pacific Railway Commission with tenfold force. The functions of the Pacific Railway Commission will, we presume, be in some measure judicial; it will be called upon virtually to decide questions between the present Government and the last: but, appointed as it has been, by the present Government when Parliament was not sitting, its authority as a tribunal will be absolutely null.

—Judge Gowan, whose utterances always command attention, has been delivering himself on several questions of jurisprudence and, among them, on the close connection between intemperance and crime. His words will, no doubt, give a fresh impetus to the Prohibition movement. On this subject we feel as if we were fighting our best friends, so strong is our sympa-

thy with the end, while we retain our misgiving as to the means. That criminals are very often intemperate is beyond dispute; that intemperance is the grand source of crime, so that by stopping the sale of liquor we should cut up crime by the root, is a position as to which we have our doubts. With regard to Maine, there is, to say the least, a strong conflict of evidence, though in Maine the contraband sale of liquor is so large that the law can hardly be said to be fairly tried, a circumstance which, however, betrays another weak point in the case for Prohibition. But crime is rife enough in Spain, Italy, and parts of France, though the people of those countries are not intemperate: the Spanish people are always described as remarkably temperate, and in days when Madrid was a den of lust and murder, it was regarded as utterly shameful in a Spanish gentleman to get drunk. However, if it really is the fact that crime is to a great extent the offspring of drunkenness, and if nothing can extirpate drunkenness but Prohibition, let us have Prohibition by all means: nobody will refuse to sacrifice a trifling indulgence for so vast a public gain. Only let us do the thing effectually, and not by halves. There is but one way of preventing drink from being sold, and that is to prevent it from being made. If it is made or imported it will find its way, openly or covertly, to the thirsty. Nothing can be more absurd than the mixture of morality and fiscality shown in legislating against drinking, and at the same time raising a revenue from drink. Let us forbid the production or importation of any kind of intoxicating liquor, without regard to its quality or to the class of the consumer. This will be business. To drive the trade into clandestine corners and into bad hands by imperfect interference, giving at the same time to party governments unconstitutional powers which are sure to be abused, seems to us, we must say, to be the most untenable course of all.

—A manifesto put forth by the new *St. James's Gazette*, in England, has revived the question between independent and

party Journalism. The *Mail*, as by chivalry bound, defends partizanship. We do not want to say anything extreme on this or on any other subject; but, if the word partizan has a meaning, it means preference of party to truth, and it is difficult to imagine how the preference of anything to truth can be in itself otherwise than a defect in a public instructor. The *Mail* would hardly deny that its calling is that of an advocate. It is perfectly true, and ought never to be forgotten, that an independent journal must have all the faults and weaknesses of its writers, who do not alter their understandings or their characters, by going behind type; it may be ill-informed, injudicious, whimsical, and even worse; but it is, at least, within the pale of allegiance to truth and justice; it is not bound by the law of its being always to write in favour of one side and against the other. If it is in respectable hands, you have, at all events, the satisfaction of knowing that the writer tries to lead you right. Facts, at any rate, he can hardly have any motive for misrepresenting or suppressing, whereas party journals have a motive to which they too often yield. It seems to us that the public is becoming sensible of this; that independent, or to use the more exact as well as the more modest term, non-party journalism, is gaining ground, and that the leaders of the press themselves are tending in that direction. However, as good sense requires, we provisionally accept the situation. Party is a soft name for faction, the bane of free communities which, instead of accepting it as the permanent basis of government, will have in the end to get rid of it or die. Such is our belief; but while the party system lasts there must be organs, and the conduct of the organs must be judged, not according to the public morality of the future, but according to the public morality of the present, by the rules of advocacy and not by those of inquiry. How widely one organ may differ from another in character and in the kind of influence it exerts on the community, appears plainly enough from the contrast between the *Mail* as it is now, and the *Mail* as it was when, being "written by gentlemen for gentlemen," it contained in every number edi-

torials which would have disgraced the veriest cad. The worst thing, obviously, that can happen to a community is the dominmination of a single organ without any counterpoise on the other side, especially if that organ is employed not only for party but for personal ends. Such was our condition here till we were rescued by the enterprise, energy, and literary ability of the *Mail*, for which all sensible citizens, whatever may be their political opinions or their abstract theories of journalism, know that they have practically much reason to be thankful.

—Again Sir Charles Tupper has been trying to toy with the *Globe*, and again he is a sad example of unrequited affection. It is not easy to understand this implacable antipathy. Dark allusions are made by the *Globe* to the Spring Hill Coal Mine. Does the vestal fire of indignation against all forms of jobbery and corruption glow with such unquenchable fierceness in the breast of Mr. Gordon Brown? Sir Charles Tupper may feel that he has a special reason for complaining of this second rebuff because he was laying a wreath upon the grave in which we have been told, with some injustice to its occupant, that all bitterness is buried. But the fact is that he had better have held his tongue, or at least have confined himself to those expressions of feeling at a tragic occurrence in which all may, without hypocrisy, join. When he praises Mr. George Brown, he lays himself open to the remark that he is either telling untruths or has told untruths till now. Death does not change the record, and there cannot be a worse moment for passing judgment on any man's acts or character than that which immediately follows his violent end. Partiality, enhanced by pity, may subscribe for a statue, but a more judicial posterity will write the inscription, and do justice on the one hand to Mr. Brown, on the other to the reputations without number which he assailed and to which also justice is due. When the statue is tendered for erection in a public place, opinion will be fairly challenged, and then Sir Charles Tupper and every one else will be at liberty to speak the truth.

—June brings the pleasant scenes of College Commencements and their gala rhetoric, which, however, is not altogether exempt from the liabilities of rhetoric in general. Everybody cheers the speaker who calls for more education—above all for more College education, and for an increase in the number of students. This sympathy with culture is of course entirely to be commended. Nevertheless, it may soon be time to look about us a little, and see whither we are practically tending. Is it not possible that the lighter and more intellectual callings may become over-stocked? In that case, is it not possible that the number of graduates may become too large, and that in increasing it without limit we may be multiplying disappointment and distress? That men who have had a college education will return to work on farms, behind counters, or in any rough practical line, and adorn labour with the refinements of classic culture is a pleasant dream; but we fear it is a dream. Even Agricultural Colleges are found to indispose students for the work for which they are a special preparation. It must be remembered that one of the great lines into which college graduates have gone, the ministry, is, amidst all these theological disquietudes, in a rather precarious state. One of our reasons for looking with mistrust on the multiplication of small universities has always been that the ease with which their degrees may be obtained seems likely to draw to them young men who had better not graduate at all. It is, at least, worth consideration whether our advance should not be rather in the direction of selection than that of extension; whether we should not rather aim at providing facilities for young men specially qualified for literary and scientific professions than at pressing those who are not specially qualified to come in. For our own part, we confess we have misgivings as to the elevating and refining effects of a college life on youths who have not a genuine love of learning. On the other hand, we have a higher opinion than most people seem to have of the discipline, mental as well as moral, of regular and serious business. Nor, with the variety of information given by newspapers and the immense increase

of literary privileges of all kinds, can any active-minded man of business fail to pick up a good deal of general knowledge, however remote from the Temple of the Muses his office may be. In England there is a large leisure class, the young men of which must be disposed of somewhere between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one; and, upon the whole, they are better disposed of at the universities than they would be elsewhere, though some parents prefer the army, as a stricter discipline. But when a young man is destined for business, we are inclined to think that there is a great deal to be said for sending him into it as early as possible, after giving him a good plain education.

The thoughts of many people are beginning to take a somewhat similar direction with regard to our Public School system The growing expensiveness, and the undue extent to which, as is alleged, it casts on the community a duty belonging to parents, are perhaps the most frequent subjects of complaint. With regard to the second point, it may be said in reply that so large a proportion of our people contribute to the maintenance of the schools as to render them a sort of joint-stock institution, except in the case of the rich, who do not use the public schools, though they get the value of their money in social security, not to put the case on higher grounds. What seems to us more worthy of serious consideration is the tendency of the system, if not kept well within bounds, to engender a feeling of superiority to manual labour, and to send boys from the plough to the city, where they find too many immigrants already, and form a superfluous, or worse than superfluous, population. This evil has been long felt in the States, some say that it is beginning to be felt here. On all accounts, ambitious subjects, which inflate without instructing, should be struck out of the curriculum, and the public education should be limited to the necessary elements well taught.

If an allusion to education in a speech is sure to draw applause an allusion to female education is sure to draw thunders: everybody cheers gallantly for the ladies, and this really irrele-

vant sentiment (for what has our general feeling for women to do with the merits of a special mode of educating them?) is likely to have too much influence in deciding the truly momentous question of Co-education. We do not want here to embark upon that question. We own that we are of the number of those who think that in having two sexes instead of one, nature has shown her taste and judgment, and that men and women will be better companions and helps for each other, if the sexes are brought up with a view to partnership, not to rivalry and competition. The wealth of marriage will surely be enhanced by a variety rather than by a monotony of accomplishments. However, let Co-education be tried, since worthy people think it is to do great things for us, so long as it is to end there, and a retiring youth is not to be constrained to lead a senior wrangler to the Hymeneal altar. The only thing we have to say here is that those who undertake the responsibility of drawing woman from what has been hitherto her kingdom and her shrine into the paths of intellectual and professional ambition ought to consider well whether there will be employment for her there. A crowd of women, left at the bottom of all the professions, after renouncing domestic and maternal happiness, would not be a very happy result of Co-education. There are in Canada some excellent Ladies' Colleges, where women are educated high, yet in a womanly way. We shall display no bigotry by wishing these prosperity. Upon the principle of the Co-education theory they ought perhaps to be called upon to admit male students, but upon the whole we hope that requirement will not be forced upon them.

President White, of Cornell University, who is now Ambassador at Berlin, has been stung by the German satires on American Bogus Degrees into addressing to his Government an indignant remonstrance against the system. Of bogus degrees he may perhaps get rid; but he will not get rid of worthless degrees till he gets rid of one-horse universities; and this, the system once established, he will find it difficult to do. His own enterprise in the State of New York makes no progress in that direction.

With us, it is too apparent that University Consolidation, which at one moment seemed not far off, is a mirage and will be nothing more, unless the subject should be some day taken up by an able and powerful Minister of Education. The case has in fact become more hopeless than ever, since the foundation of the new University of London. Victoria and Queen's, under able men, have grown into important institutions, with great trains of alumni, doing good work, and not merely of a denominational kind, for though their governing bodies are denominational, their students are of various denominations. They have established a claim to recognition; yet it is difficult to say where the means of according them recognition are to be found. It is a pity, because not only is a really national or Provincial University essential to the maintenance of a standard for degrees, and for the other direct objects of these institutions, but it would form the natural centre of our whole system of public education.

—Our advices from Quebec confirm with regard to that Province, as well as with regard to the Maritime Provinces, so far as they come under the view of our correspondents in Quebec, the account of the ominous change in popular sentiment described with regard to Nova Scotia by the correspondent of the *Globe*. Anti-Confederationism, we are told, is spreading as it never spread, and is avowed as it never was avowed, before. Such is the result of the present policy, for opposing which good citizens are denounced as traitors. The far-reaching ambition of Sir Francis Hincks is magnanimously bent on extending the Dominion to the Pacific. Prudence, pointing to the symptoms in his immediate neighbourhood, whispers him first to take care that there shall be a Dominion to extend. Compared with this movement of opinion, the Chapleau-Prentice scandal is of little importance. It is of the ordinary type, and whatever may be the ultimate verdict on it, reveals the element in which politicians live. "As you have referred to this loan," says Mr. Prentice to Mr. Chapleau, "it may be

well to record the circumstances, and the attempts at black-mailing connected with it. Your faithful allies, Mr. C. A. Dansereau and Mr. J. R. Middlemiss sought me, saying that through your influence they could procure for me the negotiation of the 1878 Goverment loan, if I would divide commissions with them, which I readily agreed to do. Subsequently their rapacity increased, and they diverted two-thirds of the commission to be allowed me by the Government, Mr. Dansereau informing me that 'you had to be provided for' and that if I did not agree to this he would prevent me from getting the loan." Evidently there has been a lamentable falling out among gentlemen who lately were friends; but it unfortunately does not follow that the public will come by its own.

The storm over, Ultramontanism in Quebec again puts out its head, and in the form of a Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of the Province, asserts again the immunities of the pulpit, and the right of the Church to interfere with political elections, of course on purely moral grounds. "Everybody knows," says the Pastoral, "how loudly the Bishops have proclaimed liberty of opinion in matters purely political; but in exercising this liberty, it too often appears that people infringe the principles of morality, either by acting on motives which these principles condemn, or by violating the laws of justice, charity or truth, and then it is the duty of the shepherds of souls, in the confessional as well as from the pulpit, to reprove that which God forbids and which the civil law itself would punish if it could reach the offence." Grant this, together with the inviolable secresy of the confessional, which also the Pastoral asserts, and the result is evidently a supremacy of the priesthood, though under the pretence of upholding public morality, and even of supporting the civil power. We all know what the Syllabus and the Encyclical comprehend under moral principle. The struggle against ecclesiastical power and civil liberty is clearly recounted by Mr. Charles Lindsey in his "Rome in Canada:" though it was suspended for a moment it has not ended, nor will it end till Ultramontanism has died or killed Modern Civilization.

—At Chicago the question between General Grant and his competitors personally was swallowed up in the question between the Republic and the Military Presidency for life. The Republic triumphed; and the Third Term conspiracy received a total overthrow. Fortunately its managers did not withdraw or compromise; they struggled to the end, and were decisively beaten on the main issue, and by a great majority, in the last ballot. They had striven to gag and manacle the Convention with instructions and unit rules: they had plied every engine of force and fraud; and had they succeeded, it would have been, to all intents and purposes, a *coup d'état* under political forms. Their language when they spoke of Grant and his opponents was similar to that of the satellites and sabreurs of the Second Empire. The most violent of them actually attempted to expel three Western Virginians from the Convention for refusing to renounce a liberty of future action, the surrender of which would have been a flagrant breach of their duty as citizens to the State. Evidently these men did not mean to stick at a third term; their aim was an election of Grant for life, with themselves as his pachas. Nor, had they conquered once, can we see how they could have been prevented from conquering again. In conquering once, their Machine would have proved itself stronger than all the elements of resistance combined; four years more of power and patronage would have made it stronger still, and at the same time have given its managers a still deeper stake in the game. Had one of the conspirators been the nominee, the others would have been his rivals, and their rivalry might have brought his reign to a close; but Grant was outside rivalry, he was the indispensable instrument and figure-head of the whole band. Not from that quarter would deliverance, as some fancied, have come. The danger was great; once more the Republic has escaped; once more the ship is past the breakers; but surely, to all thinking men, the perilous tendencies of the elective Presidency must have been revealed in a glaring light.

If one man is more to be congratulated than another on the

result, it is General Grant. He had already wiped out no small portion of his services, and he has narrowly escaped wiping out the whole. He is one of the few men in history of whom it will be said that their greatest piece of good fortune was a defeat. That his third administration could have redeemed the first two, as some of his friends hoped, or affected to hope, was impossible; the very conditions of his re-election would have made him more than ever a slave to the influences to which, after a feeble effort to emancipate himself, he succumbed before, and have compelled him, instead of doing better, to do worse. After all, the Republic was not so easily quit of the ordinary consequences of civil war as was supposed: the army has reappeared in enormous demands for pensions: it is said also in the increased number of tramps: and one of the generals has lent himself and more than lent himself to an attempt at usurpation. The Civil War could hardly have been avoided, but those who struggled to avoid it have been amply justified by the result.

That the Third Term Conspiracy should be foiled, and its apparatus of intrigue broken up, was the thing above all others to be desired; but the readers of the BYSTANDER will be prepared to hear that we also greatly rejoice in the nomination of General Garfield, though we were far enough from foreseeing that it would come to pass. We are sick of the phrase "self-made men," but General Garfield has pushed his way from the position of a farmer's boy to that in which he now stands, as the most impartial judges assure us, by means as honourable as is possible in the case of a party politician. His ability, force, and gallant bearing in political battle cannot be questioned; they were displayed at the Convention in a way which must have greatly contributed to his nomination. In the war he showed himself both valiant in action and a good chief of the staff; and his record is not only an assurance of the courage of which, if he becomes President, he will have much need, but no mean title to the goodwill of the soldiers, with whom, indeed, he is said to be on excellent terms. Among the various call-

ings to which, with the versatility of his race, he has turned his hand, teaching the classics has been one, and we hear that he has kept up his reading. If he has, the Universities have a part in him, and certainly they have contributed to his triumph over the Third Term. As we have said before, they have done not a little to develop the moral forces by which the country has been saved from its peril. Culture will not supply the defects of nature or the lack of experience. It will not give a man a strong heart, energy, shrewdness, or knowledge of the world. But it will give him breadth and elevation of mind: it will put him above the influence of Machines and Bosses; it may, perhaps, enable him to help in putting other people above those influences if he knows how to use his tongue or his pen. If he is a journalist it will prevent him from being a mere organist or a rib-stabber. It was said that the German Universities conquered at Sadowa and Sedan by imparting intelligence to German armies and science to German war. In another sense the American Universities may be said to have conquered at Chicago.

—General Garfield having been nominated, it will, of course, become the business of the press, on the other side, to rake up or invent every kind of slander against him. A Presidential election is the Carnival of Calumny. Already the fetid torrent begins to flow. "Garfield,—the salary-grabber. Garfield,—the proven beneficiary of the Credit Mobilier swindle. Garfield,—who sold himself to the De Golyer Paving Company for the pitiful sum of $5,000. Garfield,—the assassin of Fitzjohn Porter. Garfield,—the pulp protectionist. Garfield,—a man with the voice of a lion and the heart of a sheep—irresolute in purpose, and with a record stained in every page." In due course of time, we shall no doubt hear that he has made false returns of Income Tax; that the sudden death of his mother-in-law was very suspicious, that his father was an inmate of Sing Sing, and that his mother took in washing and stole the clothes. It seems that his skirt just touched the projectors of the Credit Mobilier, and, of

course, was defiled, but that there is nothing amounting to a stain upon his record. General Porter, whom he "assassinated," is, we believe, alive and well, though not on the highest pinnacle of military reputation. The only charge likely to be pressed is that of complicity with Oakes Ames in the affair of the Credit Mobilier, and with regard to this, it is almost enough to point to the ridiculous smallness of the sum ($369) for which a first-rate politician, with the highest hopes, is alleged to have sold his character, and placed himself at the mercy of his enemies. We are reminded of the solemn investigation which was instituted into the case of Speaker Kerr, another first-class politician, though one of the other party, who was alleged to have sold a nomination to West Point for $400 depreciated paper currency, employing as a go-between a door-keeper of the House. There is no fable, however preposterous, that would not find credence in a faction fight. In time, perhaps, the public will grow sick of this, and journalists, seeing that in traducing a man who is the choice of at least half the nation, they are traducing the nation itself, will learn to wage a less ignoble war.

General Garfield is a vigorous and vivid speaker, and as, in case of his election, we are likely to have a good deal to do with him, a specimen of his style may not be without interest. Here is the conclusion of his speech on accepting the Senatorship from Ohio.

"And now, gentlemen of the General Assembly, without distinction of party, I recognise this tribute and compliment made to me to-night. Whatever my own course may be in the future, a large share of the inspiration of my future public life will be drawn from this occasion and these surroundings, and I shall feel anew the sense of obligation that I feel to the State of Ohio. Let me venture to point a single sentence in regard to that work. During the twenty years that I have been in public life, almost eighteen of it in Congress of the United States, I have tried to do one thing. Whether I was mistaken or otherwise, it has been the plan of my life to follow my convictions at whatever personal cost to myself. I have represented for many years a district in Congress whose approbation I greatly desired;

but though it may seem, perhaps, a little egotistical to say it, I yet desired still more the approbation of one person, and his name was Garfield. (Laughter and applause.) He is the only man that I am compelled to sleep with (laughter), and eat with, live with, and die with; and if I could not have his approbation, I should have bad companionship. (Renewed laughter and applause.) And in this larger constituency which has called me to represent them now, I can only do what is true to my best self, applying the same rules. And if I should be so unfortunate as to lose the confidence of this larger constituency, I must do what every other fair minded man has to do—carry his political life in his hand and take the consequences. But I must follow what seems to me to be the only safe rule of my life; and with that view of the case, and with that much personal reference, I leave that subject. Thanking you again, fellow-citizens, members of the General Assembly, Republicans and Democrats—all, party man as I am—thanking you both for what you have done and for this cordial and manly greeting, I bid you good-night."

The end of the Convention was good; it was hardly to be expected that the Convention itself would be an edifying scene. To strangers looking on, it appeared an excited mob at the mercy of the last speaker. The conclave which elects a Pope is secret, and all the intrigues and machinations go on behind closed doors. In an American Convention the same things are done openly, before a great audience, and amidst the uproar of a vast assembly, with its emotions at fever heat. The most exciting debates ever witnessed must have been those of the French Convention, in which the speakers were struggling for life. Next, perhaps, would come those of the English Parliament, in the time of Charles I., when the great leaders of the Revolution and the Reaction wrestled oratorically with each other on the floor of the House of Commons, and there was no speaking to Buncombe, or to the reporters, but every faculty of men of transcendant ability was strained to sway the vote of the Assembly which they addressed. We know what scenes took place in the French Convention: we know that, after the midnight division on the Grand Remonstrance, the two parties which had been grappling all day in debate, laid their hands

upon their swords, and had almost sheathed them in each others' breasts: we know what storms of passion swept both Lords and Commons during the discussion of the Reform Bill of 1832. At Chicago, the battle was for an enormous prize, the elective monarchy of the United States with its prodigious mass of patronage, and not only for this, but for the very life of Republican institutions. No wonder, then, from that great multitude there were outbursts of passion, which shocked the cool observer and made him shudder at the thought that the barque which bore the fortunes of the State should be committed to that angry sea. An optimist would, perhaps, say that the good sense of the people and their hold upon vital principles must be strong, if, through such a week of tempest, with intrigue actively at work behind the scenes, the right result could be worked out after all. But he must be an optimist with a vengeance, who can think that these Presidential elections, which merge all the more vital interests of the community in what is essentially a struggle for office, divide the nation against itself, and set it on fire with passions only a degree less fierce than those of civil war, are not a most serious source of danger and a subject for most anxious reflection to all who desire the permanence of free institutions. Not that the evil is confined to the United States, or that we who live under institutions nominally monarchical have any right to point the finger at our neighbours and hug ourselves on our immunity. Under a Constitutional Monarchy, the Prime Minister is the real king; he is elective like the President; and the process of his election, though somewhat different and not so regular in its recurrence, is attended with hardly less of excitement, disturbance and corruption. England, suspended as she was for at least eighteen months between Beaconfield and Gladstone, with a general election always in view, and the political passions in full blast, was hardly in a better case than the United States have been for the last year, and will be for the four months to come.

General Hancock, the Democratic nominee, is a respectable soldier; but he is evidently chosen less on account of any posi-

tive merits than because there is nothing to prevent the whole party from uniting on him. In a few weeks the forces on each side will have developed themselves, and we shall be able to form a surmise as to the probable result.

—It was unreasonable in English Liberals to expect an abrupt change in English diplomacy. But a change, though not an abrupt one, is taking place. One sign of it is the cordial alliance which has evidently sprung up between England and Italy. Like all other young and struggling nationalities. Italy was an object of Lord Beaconsfield's peculiar hatred: he wished to identify himself not with parvenus but with the most ancient and respectable families, and he assiduously nourished the antipathy of the Court to Italian Independence and its champions, while he never lost an opportunity of displaying his own. Austria was the special object of his diplomatic affection. It is, of course, necessary to treat Austria with good faith as well as with courtesy, but the relative degrees of affinity are reversed, and the reversal is significant of the general return from the policy of the Holy Alliance to the policy of Canning; from a policy which retires with the train of Night to a policy which comes with the Morning Star. Greece will, of course, be the gainer; her hopes live again, though amidst the rivalry of jealous interests she may not at present get all she desires. It will be seen whether England is effaced by a return to her more generous self. There is also a perceptible decrease in the councils of Europe of the spirit of intrigue and conspiracy. Open dealing and frankness of speech are regaining their ascendancy, and their revival is in itself a strong security for the reign of righteousness and peace.

All securities of that kind are likely to be needed, for Europe is evidently again approaching a crisis of the Eastern question. Turkey has done numberless wrongs to civilization. Yet, in her present state, she is an object less of resentment than of pity. The death rattle is in her throat, and around her dy-

ing bed are a crowd of creditors fiercely demanding their debts, of censors goading her with reproaches and menaces to reform. Reform! She is no longer an organized Empire. Her government has hardly the means of transmitting its commands, much less of enforcing obedience. The English Ministry which, instead of constraining her to yield to the moderate demands of the Conference, encouraged her to confront a Russian war, sealed her doom, and itself gave the signal for general spoliation by the seizure of Cyprus. It would take a prophet to say what the result will be. A Sclavonic Austria, combining the Danubian and Balkan Principalities with her own Sclav Provinces, is a possibility which begins to loom. This would certainly involve the transfer of German Austria to the Fatherland, which would receive the accession without hesitation, if once the question between the State and the Papacy were settled and the fear of adding to the Catholic element were removed. It would also involve the deposition of the Magyar from his ascendancy over the Sclav, and probably the ruin of the Magyar nationality, if a dominant race deserves that name. Magyar patriotism has always been the patriotism of an oligarch who wanted liberty to trample on his own Sclav. Had the Magyar patriots of 1848 been willing to make common cause with the Sclavs, they would have been victorious; it was by haughtily refusing all association that they cast Jellachich and his power into the opposite scale, and brought down upon them Russia, the protectress of the Sclavonic race. But the House of Hapsburg must have greater breadth of view and a better faculty for self-adaptation than it has yet shown, if it can play a part at once so novel and so grand.

—In England they are still moralizing over the sudden revolution and its causes. Conservative writers ascribe it to popular caprice, and say that the Ballot has put the nation into the hands of a fickle and inscrutable power, which pulls down and sets up governments without motive or intelligible ground.

There is some truth in what they say. The Ballot, while it shields conviction from intimidation, does give unlimited scope for the indulgence of whims, piques, and special motives of all kinds. Its influence may have been felt in the changes of fortune which have occurred in some bye elections since the Liberal victory. A man is offended by the appointment of a Roman Catholic Viceroy of India, by the retention of Sir Bartle Frere, by the apology to Austria, or, it may be, by some personal disappointment. With open voting, he would be ashamed to turn round in a moment, but under cover of the Ballot he will gratify his spleen without compunction. Unquestionably, with Party and the Ballot, the foundation of government is becoming unstable, and statesmen will be called upon to consider how its stability can be increased. But, in the present instance, the revolution, though sudden and surprising, was perfectly intelligible. A nation dependent not only for its wealth, but for the daily bread of its swarming millions, upon a world-wide commerce, found itself being drawn by ambitious adventurers into a policy which was pronounced by so cool and competent a judge as Lord Derby to be one of extreme peril. This was enough both to turn many thousands of votes and to draw out thousands of quiet commercial citizens who usually abstain from voting. But, besides this, the domestic policy of the Government, which was closely connected with its foreign policy, had raised questions which brought again face to face, though in a modern guise, the parties which encountered each other on the battle-fields of Charles I. The serious, devout, liberty-loving spirit of the nation embodied in the Scotch Presbyterians and the English Nonconformists, as of old in the Puritans, stood once more in arms against the attempt to revive court influence and unparliamentary government. The almost unanimous uprising of Scotland against the Government was most significant. "We will send back all the Tory members in one compartment of a railway carriage," said one Scotchman to another before the election. "Yes," was the rejoinder, "and they shall all have room to stretch their legs." A compartment,

it will be remembered, holds eight, on two seats facing each other. The vaunt was very nearly fulfilled.

There are a number of sections in the Liberal party, which, in fact, is the nation, less the landed aristocracy and certain special interests, such as those of the State Church and the Licensed Victuallers, in alliance with it. Between these sections there were sure to be jealousies and discontents, with expressions of disappointment, after the victory and division of power. The jealousies and discontents have come, the voices of disappointment are heard. But while there are hot heads in the party, there are also cool heads, which will take care, when it comes to the point, that dissatisfaction shall not go the length of disruption, and that the fruits of the great victory shall not be thrown away. We, on this side of the water, get the worst view of Mr. Gladstone's situation. The correspondents must live in London, and London is the heart of Jingoism, aristocracy, fashion, militarism, and everything that is hostile to the new Minister. No doubt, the difficulties with which he has to contend are great enough, but his power of contending with them is great also. Of that his Budget is a proof.

Lord Beaconsfield, though he speaks very clearly, is often misreported. The report of his speech to his party at Bridgewater House made him, as he wrote to the *Times*, say the very reverse of what he really said. His veracity has been confirmed in an unusual manner. He was reported to have counselled moderation: evidently, as he says, he did the reverse, for nothing can be less moderate than the conduct of his followers. They actually abetted, as far as they durst, the attack of Mr. O'Donnell on the personal character of Challemel Lacour, the ambassador designate of France, and this with important negotiations on the subject of the Tariff pending between the two countries. A nice set of investigations Governments would have on their hands, if they were to undertake to inquire whether any Talleyrand, Pelissier, or Marquis of Hertford (to take an English specimen) had ever strayed from the paths of virtue! The attack seems to have emanated partly from Fenianism, partly

from Sybaritism, the Fenians being incensed because Lacour had refused them the support of his journal, the Sybarites because he was not likely to make the French Embassy a temple of pleasure. Society always thinks that it has a right to a voice in the appointment of the French ambassador.

The vindictive violence of the Tories has been still more conspicuous in the Bradlaugh case than in that of Challemel Lacour. Their aim obviously is to fix the imputation of complicity with irreligion and blasphemy upon Mr. Gladstone, whom they well know to be a sincerely religious man, and whom, in fact, their organs have always ridiculed for his piety. Surely no right-minded Christian can fail to be filled with disgust by the sight of a crowd of infuriated partisans throwing themselves into paroxysms of affected zeal for the honour due to the Deity, when everybody knows that their real object is political revenge. Some of the most vociferous of these champions of religion are mere men about town, and even next door to scamps. Others are unscrupulous lawyers, in whose breasts probably no spiritual emotion ever found a place. Any one who knows English society would be prepared to believe that no small portion of the public assailants of Bradlaugh privately holds views not much differing from his. The whole set follow a leader who has avowedly made Bolingbroke his model, and has imitated him, not only in attempting to revive personal government, but in flattering the prejudices of the State clergy for his political purposes, while he laughs in his sleeve at their creed. In dating letters "Maundy Thursday," discoursing about the angelic origin of man, and ostentatiously attending Church ceremonies and sacraments, as in his elaborate performance of the part of a country squire, it is well understood that Lord Beaconsfield is like the actor who, that he might thoroughly enter into the spirit of his part, blacked himself all over to play Othello. The Duke of Somerset has written a treatise against Christianity; yet he sits unmolested in the House which is legally confined to Christians. He is a duke; Bradlaugh is a plebeian of the coarsest type, and there can be

little doubt that, in addition to the political, there is a social feeling against him. Had he been allowed to take the oath, as he was willing to do, at the risk of his own character, he would probably have sunk in the estimation of his followers, and no sort of mischief would have ensued; for the idea that his presence could have polluted a House which has contained the members of the Hell Fire Club is really too absurd. As it is, he will henceforth be the cynosure not only of Atheists, but of all people of extreme opinions, who see themselves martyred in him, and as he is a man of far greater force than Dr. Kenealy, to whom he has been perversely compared, it is not unlikely that he may become a power indeed. No success will attend the attempt to taint Mr. Gladstone's religious reputation; and though the immediate result may be an apparent development of schisms among his followers, the ultimate effect is likely to be the restoration of his popularity with his Radical wing, the disaffection of which was his special danger, and which will rally to its chief when it sees him assailed for defending liberty of opinion. Religion will, of course, suffer by the championship of hypocrisy, but she may be indemnified in the end by the total abolition of tests. She would still be very strong if it were not for her defenders.

—There can be little doubt that France has done wisely in granting an amnesty to her Communists, to all, at least, who do not belong to the class of ordinary convicts as having been guilty of murder or arson. The utmost evil that can arise from the presence of a few hundreds of characters, once dangerous but now discredited and probably impotent, is small compared with the good that must arise from finally closing the gate and burying the memories of civil strife. The most momentous result of the discussion, however, is the accession of power which it has brought to Gambetta, who is now proclaimed "real chief, real orator, real minister, and real protector," "Emperor of the Republic," "more completely master of France than any one

since Napoleon." This tendency to look to a chief rather than to institutions, and to put the country into the hands of a single man, merely on account of his brilliancy, is a relic, and not a desirable relic, of the state of things before constitutional government. If it is true that Gambetta can say that "he is the Republic," the progress made since the same thing was said by Louis XIV. is one rather of form than of substance. But the formation of political character is a slow process, and in France wonderful progress has been made. What seems most certain is that Gambetta must soon be the official, as well as the real, head of the Government. A great speech is, perhaps, not the most satisfactory title to supreme power; nor is the oratorical temperament, in which there must be a good deal of passion and of onesidedness, by any means that of cool-headed, sure-footed and comprehensive statesmanship. The greatest orators have not, as a rule, been very successful in practical politics. Pericles seems to have combined in the highest degree the faculty of swaying an audience with sagacity in council. But Demosthenes, as a statesman, was at all events less fortunate, and Cicero, though not devoid of wise conceptions, was more unlucky still. Mirabeau, the closest prototype of Gambetta, died just as the leadership of the Revolution had come definitively into his hands, and he was about to be tried as the constructor of a new order of things; but the indications, so far as they go, leave great doubt as to his probable success, though the departure of any man who retained control over the torrent was deeply to be deplored. In England, the most splendid example of an orator-statesman is Chatham, yet there are those who regard Chatham's administration as rather brilliant than wise or beneficent. Certain it is that he spent the savings of Walpole's prudence, that he heaped up a great debt, and that he totally neglected domestic questions generally, and especially the pressing questions of Parliamentary and Administrative Reform. Gambetta's inclinations are supposed to be towards a war policy; if they are, he may pull down the house which he has done so much to build—for a war policy means an Empire.

—July brings the holidays, and, with this unresting generation, a holiday means, for those who can afford it, a tour. Our children will enter into the heritage of material improvements acquired by the ceaseless toil of their fathers, and they may taste the pleasures of repose. But to the man of the present day those pleasures are unknown. He has never felt, nor can he comprehend, the sweetness and the balmy influence of a day of perfect ease and leisure spent in his own home—of getting up with the thought that you have nothing to do but to enjoy yourself, read what you like, if you have a mind to read, and lie or wander about if you have not. Give him a holiday, and he will take advantage of it to travel as far as ever he can by rail. It has been said of the English, that they take their pleasures very sadly, and it may be said, with equal truth, that they take their rest very laboriously. It is "strenuous idleness" with a vengeance. Not only the supreme happiness but the sovereign remedy now is change. "A change does one so much good." If one has the fidgets perhaps it does; but for nervous exhaustion of a more serious kind, the best remedy is tranquillity. It is a fair question for a sanitary debating society whether health is really gained by two or three months of rattling in railway cars and gormandizing at *tables d'hôte*. Not even the disturbers of the soul are left behind. For the cares and hurry of business are substituted the cares and hurry of packing up baggage, catching trains and boats, wrangling with cabmen and porters, and scrambling for rooms at hotels. The British Consul at Lucerne, in the heart of the finest Alpine scenery, used to say that thousands of Englishmen came there every year, and all apparently with one object—to catch the Altorf boat. Probably those who were in danger of missing the boat suffered agonies little less injurious to their nerves than would have been caused by a fall in stock. In a picture by Turner of a magnificent glen at the head of an Alpine pass, there is introduced a travelling carriage posting through. It is intended, no doubt, to give the measure of the cliffs; but our sense of the everlasting calm and solitude is intensified by this transient irruption

of unrest. If we could look into the carriage, we should very likely find its occupant diligently studying some road-book to see how far he could manage to push his journey before night-fall. But he will have done his Alpine pass.

Sixty millions, the Americans are said to spend annually in Europe. How many millions' worth of ideas do they bring back? A good many of them, at all events, would probably be able to tell you about as much of the romantic and historic scenes which they have visited as a sailor can tell you of the ports at which he has touched. The things that tourists remember are the hotels. What hotel did you go to at Rome, at Chamouni, at Florence? They religiously go through buildings, galleries and views, as prescribed in the guide book, that they may afterwards, with a good conscience, enjoy their dinners. They have the satisfaction of saying that they have travelled, and seen all the famous things; otherwise, if they were shot to and fro daily by railroad between two first-rate restaurants, it would come to pretty much the same thing. These are the tourists whose company it is not supercilious to shun. To shun the company of fellow-pilgrims, enjoying the beauties and grandeurs like yourself, is absurd. But you may fairly accuse fortune, if you enter St. Peter's or Pompeii for the first time with one of Cook's parties, or what is even now a greater nuisance, a German "caravan." You will not fare much better if you come in the way of an "educational" expedition from the United States.

Tourists of the worthier class often, perhaps, lose much of the highest pleasure of their tours, and certainly much of the pleasure of retrospect, from want of a little preparation and a little method in sight-seeing. The guide books do their duty: they tell you at each place everything that is to be seen. You go round and see everything—ancient, mediæval, or modern—churches, galleries, factories, just as they happen to lie in your hackman's route, without any principle of selection, and without any mental pigeon-holes in which to store separately the different impressions. The result is bewilderment and surfeit, with

a general recollection of having tramped about a great deal and paid a large sum in fees. In your overcharged and dazed memory, the Middle Ages are jumbled with the Renaissance, and both with the works of the present time, like the figures blended with each other by the whirl of a thaumatrope. People may be seen, catalogue in hand, going through every picture in an interminable gallery, with an effect about as satisfactory as that which would have been produced by looking for the same length of time alternately at the numbers in an auction catalogue and at a painter's palette. One impression distinctly formed is, for after-enjoyment, worth a hundred which are indistinct. A man who goes to see a country thoroughly prepared by previous study is his own guide book; he knows exactly what he wants to see, sees it, takes it in thoroughly, and makes it his own for ever. But most tourists would be grateful for a guide book that would put them in the way of seeing intelligently, chalk out a line for them, proportioned to the time they have to spend, and show them the way to a dinner such as it may be possible for them to digest, and not to a market. Where a country full of historic monuments is to be seen, it is useful to have some historic compartments prepared for their arrangement in the mind. In seeing England, for example, the monuments of the primæval Celt, of the Roman, of the Feudalism and Catholicism of the Middle Ages, of the Elizabethan period, of that of the later Stuarts and Anne, may be kept apart and connected each with its proper associations. Of the Celtic period the great monument is, of course, Stonehenge, and an impressive object it is, if you happen to see it under the right circumstances, that is in gloomy weather, particularly at the setting in of a dark evening; for in bright weather it loses its awfulness, and its scale is really small. Of the Roman period the most interesting relics are the Great Wall in the North, once the western wing of a line of defences which shielded civilization from the Euphrates to the Solway, and Silchester, the English Pompeii, on the railway between Reading and Basingstoke, a Roman city which was destroyed by fire, but of

which the whole ground plan remains in a very perfect state. Pompeii was probably a little pleasure city: Silchester must have been a garrison town in the midst of a wild woodland district inhabited by savage clans; and we may trace, with interest, the efforts of the Roman governors and officers to indemnify themselves for their banishment from the pleasures of the capital by importing the appliances of luxury, including the elaborate warming apparatus for their houses, and, of course, the amphitheatre which was as indispensable to their corrupt tastes as the bull-ring to those of the Spaniards. The Middle Ages are represented by the old cities, the castles, the cathedrals, the monastic ruins. Chester, with its curious Rows, is of the old cities the one most commonly visited, but fully as picturesque and characteristic is Coventry, which cannot be out of anybody's way, since it lies near Stratford-on-Avon. Among the castles may be noted, as still preserving their genuine character and unmolested loneliness, Ragland, and Bodiam in Sussex, the latter built out of his spoils by one of the military adventurers who raided on France under the Plantagenets, and an interesting specimen of the incipient change of the castle into the manor house. Among the cathedrals it is impossible to go wrong, though about the poorest of them all is Chester, with which people are apt to begin, owing to its nearness to their landing place. Canterbury and Westminster are pre-eminent in historic interest, as well as among the first in religious beauty; York excels in grandeur, though the effect is somewhat cold and wanting in romance; Lincoln in exquisiteness of ornament; Durham, "half Church of God, half castle 'gainst the Scot," in majestic massiveness as well as in picturesqueness of situation; Salisbury, finished on one plan, and in the same style, is, in its symmetry and faultlessness, the Parthenon of Mediæval England; the quiet Close of Wells, encircled by ecclesiastical buildings, is the most perfect picture of cathedral life. Of the monastic ruins Fountains is the fairest and the most complete image of monasticism, but Tintern surpasses all in the beauty of situation, which was evidently an object with the builders of

these houses of contemplation and prayer. Tintern, too, has been spiritualized for us by Wordsworth. The two universities belong, architecturally as well as historically, in part to the Middle Ages; hardly in any city will you see such a galaxy of ancient buildings as that over which the eye ranges from the dome of the Radcliffe Library or the cupola of the Theatre in Oxford. But you must go in summer, in early summer if possible, when the fresh green of the groves and gardens contrasts tenderly with the grey walls, and when the velvet of the lawns is at its best. "How am I to get such a lawn," asked a lady of one of the College Fellows. "You have only to mow and roll it regularly, Madam, for two or three hundred years." Avoid Commemoration, if you want to see an ancient University, and not a modern carnival. Oxford, Windsor, Eton (the typical public school), and the beautiful reaches of the Thames, between Maidenhead and Marlowe are so easily taken together that it is a shame to be in London, as many Canadians are, without seeing them. A specimen of the Elizabethan Manor House is to be found in most districts, though the finest of them are in the south, which was then the region of wealth and civilization. Burleigh and Hatfield are in the first rank of historic interest as well as of beauty. Bramshill, the mansion built for Prince Henry, the son of James the First, and the Marcellus who, if the fates had spared him, might have averted the Civil War and changed the whole current of English history, is a noble pile, and stands on a rise in a fine wild park, whereas most of these palaces are on flats, though no doubt their broad expanses of lawns and stately shade trees set them off well. Bramshill is in the north of Hampshire, in a district which in the time of James I. touched the skirt of the New Forest, not far from the line of the South Western Railway. Compton Wyniates, in Warwickshire, is another very interesting specimen, though on a smaller scale. It may be made a point in one of those carriage tours without which it is impossible thoroughly to enjoy the richness and finish of English landscapes, or to enter into the peculiar character and

the poetry of English country life. From Oxford you may take the railroad to Banbury, about ten miles; at Banbury take a carriage and drive to Edgehill, the scene of the battle, where you are on the edge of the great central table-land of England, and look down upon a glorious champaign, as well as on the memorable field. From Edgehill, keeping the edge, you go to Compton Wyniates, and so on to Leamington, Warwick, Stratford-on-Avon, Coventry. Of the monuments of the later period the grandest is one which everybody sees, St. Paul's, as superior to St. Peter's outside as it is inferior inside. But being at Oxford, you should not fail to visit Blenheim Palace. Heavy in style it may be, but it is a real palace, magnificent, monumental, full of history, and standing in a noble specimen of an English park, with oaks like that of Tennyson's Sumner Chase. The reign of Anne, in its art as in its life, is formal, modish, periwigged, but it is picturesque, brilliant, and full of interest. Strange that so good a subject should not have found an historian. Mr. Burton's work, like Lord Stanhope's, is an utter disappointment. Really there is hardly a picture of the period of Marlborough so good as the historical passages in Thackeray's "Esmond."

—In the region of Political Economy the newest sensation is "Progress and Poverty," which has been hailed by some as an extraordinary effort of speculative genius. The writer, Mr. George, is struck by the fact, as he supposes it to be, that poverty, instead of decreasing, has increased with the progress of production, and he casts about for the cause and the remedy. The cause he finds to be individual ownership of land, which, he has persuaded himself, causes a perpetual misappropriation by the landlord in the shape of rent of that which ought to go to labour in the shape of wages, and to capital in the shape of interest. His remedy is a sweeping confiscation of all landed property by the State, without giving the owners any indemnity, which, he particularly warns us, would frustrate

his beneficent design. His first idea is to seize the land itself and let it out to the highest bidders, whose bids, it may be surmised, would not be very high, considering that the commodity put up to auction would be that of which individual ownership had just been totally abolished. But, on second thoughts, he considers it more statesmanlike so far to keep terms with existing notions as merely to confiscate, by means of a land-tax, the whole of what he decides to be rent; and he takes it for granted that the land-owners would be submissive and simple-minded enough to go on holding and tilling the land under these conditions like sheep growing fleeces to be annually shorn. To crown the wisdom of the scheme, the Government, into the hands of which the vast proceeds of the confiscation are to be put, is one which, in the case of the United States, the projector himself describes as a den of brigands. Our intelligent readers will scarcely ask for an analysis of the reasonings by which this conclusion is reached: they will be content to assume that it is a logical deduction from premises equally rational with itself.

It is more to the purpose to inquire why real property should always be picked out as the cockshy of confiscating theorists. Why do they propose to lay their hands upon your farm, any more than upon your coat or your umbrella? The solution, perhaps, is mainly to be found in a passage of Mill, which has evidently formed the germ of the work before us. "Before leaving the subject of Equality of Taxation," says Mill, "I must remark that there are cases in which exceptions may be made to it, consistently with that equal justice which is the groundwork of the rule. Suppose that there is a kind of income which constantly tends to increase, without any exertion or sacrifice on the part of the owners; these owners constituting a class in the community whom the natural course of things progressively enriches, consistently with complete passiveness on their own part. In such a case it would be no violation of the principles on which private property is grounded, if the State should appropriate this increase of wealth, or part of it, as it arises. This would not properly be taking anything from anybody; it would merely

be applying an accession of wealth, created by circumstances, to the benefit of society, instead of allowing it to become an unearned appendage to the riches of a particular class. Now, this is actually the case with rent." Is it the case with rent alone? A man buys a pair of shoes; while he sleeps, the price of leather rises and an "unearned increment" accrues to him: is the State to confiscate a corresponding portion of his shoes? The same may be said with regard to any conceivable kind of property or investment; either special circumstances, or the general prosperity of the country, may cause it to rise in value without individual exertion on the part of its owner, and thus there may be an unearned increment which, according to the theorists, ought to be confiscated by the State. Mr. Mill talks of the owners of real property as constituting "a class;" in England they may be said, with some truth, to be a class, and the laws of primogeniture and entail which they have imposed on real property for a class purpose have in no small degree contributed to the creation of socialistic feeling; but in Canada and in the United States they are no more a class than other investors. A mechanic builds two houses on his lot; in one he lives, the other he lets. In the name of common sense and justice, why is he to be despoiled of the one he lets any more than of the one in which he lives? Land, we are told, is the gift of nature, and, therefore, ought not to be appropriated. Land is the gift of nature, but cultivated land, which alone will yield anything, is as much the product of individual industry as any other article. Nor is the fact that the industry of others as well as that of the owner has been expended on it a peculiarity of a farm any more than of a plough. That common ownership of land was the primæval institution is true; but experience has led to its abandonment and to the institution of individual ownership by all civilized races. The example of the French peasantry proves that there is no incentive to industry, and consequently no stimulus to production, like individual ownership of land.

Poverty, the continued existence of which is the motive, or the pretence, for advocating, in philanthropic strains, these

schemes of public plunder would, as the history of all communistic tyrannies shows, be only aggravated by the proposed remedy. It is not a simple, but a very complex, phenomenon. Vice, which Mr. George leaves cautiously out of sight, is one of the principal sources of it, as may be learned by an inspection of the low quarters of any large city. It is generated by bad seasons, which no legislation about real property can avert, by the failure of particular trades, by changes in the course of commerce, which often throw numbers out of employment, even by inventions, which, though productive of increased wealth to the community, too often deprive many handicraftsmen of their bread. The chief cause, however, appears to be over-increase of population, as is suggested by a comparison of the condition of Ireland with that of France. Misgovernment and bad laws have, no doubt, played their part; bad laws respecting land tenure among the rest. But there was poverty, we presume, in Venice, though there the question of land tenure could hardly be said to exist. If the number of poor has increased, that of the well-to-do has increased in a much larger ratio; and it seems certain that, in countries not subject to class legislation, the tendency on the whole is towards the more general distribution of wealth as well as towards its augmentation.

This we believe to be truth: but it will not save, nor ought it to save, society from storms, unless the rich will do their duty, both actively by promoting the welfare of the community and, in the way of self-denial, by abstaining from luxury and ostentation, which, by the contrast, make poverty doubly bitter, and open its ears to the teachings of the leveller and the confiscator, however mad their doctrines may be.

—Not a day passes without our being made sensible that Society is in a state of critical transition. Its fundamental institutions are shifting their basis from the ecclesiastical to the rational, though there is nothing to hinder us from holding that beneath the rational basis, as well as beneath the eccle-

siastical, there will lie ultimately belief in God. We take up the paper and see that the proceedings in a Criminal Court are at a stand because a juror avows himself an atheist and refuses to take the oath. Fifty years ago, the Bench would at once have launched a thunderbolt against the recusant; but now it looks anxiously about for an outlet from what, in the present state of opinion, is felt to be a most embarrassing dilemma. The end, of course, will be that the oath will have to be abolished; and that in this and in all matters, we shall have to act on the thorough-going principle that the spiritual kingdom is not a kingdom of this world, nor to be sustained by any political inducements, or by the imposition of penalties of any kind on disbelief. Still, political religion has had so long a reign, and its fibres have so twined themselves with the principles of social morality, especially among the less educated and more simple-minded classes, that the change cannot fail to be full of difficulty and danger. A highly-educated man, when called upon to give evidence in a court of justice, knows that there is no difference between the sanctity of an oath and an affirmation; he knows that God is as much witness of the one as of the other, and that the invocation is merely an impressive form. But this is by no means the case with the peasant, as was shown even by the trick, formerly not uncommon, of trying to avoid the dreaded adjuration by kissing the thumb instead of the book. At first, at all events, and till popular morality has formed itself again on the fresh basis, we should expect the abolition of the oath to be followed by a relaxation of the veracity of ordinary witnesses. Something, however, must be done: otherwise, anyone who chooses to decline giving evidence, may escape by an avowal of atheism, which, though in former days it would have made him a social leper, in these days will not prevent him from retaining plenty of associates and friends. Probably the best course, practically, would be to extend the option of affirmation to all cases of conscientious objection, without requiring any specific avowal; but, in the absence of conscientious objection, to retain the oath for the present.

Prosecutions, or attempts to prosecute for blasphemy, bring the same change of public sentiment to light. Some twenty-five years ago, as the readers of Mr. Buckle know, it was possible in England to give a man a long term of imprisonment for writing blasphemous words on a gate ; and, though Mr. Buckle denounced the judge for extravagant severity, the truth was that the sentence seemed too light to the indignant neighbourhood. It is, happily, no longer possible to inflict legal punishment for opinion, however extreme ; it is to be hoped, that the days, even of social punishment, are numbered, and that all good men will soon heartily embrace the principle of perfect freedom of discussion, unchecked by threats either of faggots or of frowns, as the only possible guarantee for any kind of truth. Wanton outrage on the religious feelings of others, like any other wanton outrage, deserves chastisement ; but there is an almost insuparable difficulty in distinguishing between blasphemy of that kind, and the free, perhaps heated, expression of sincere conviction. Is the man really trying to rescue us from error, and bring us to truth ? If he is, the offensiveness of his manner is not a sufficient reason for molesting him ; it will probably be its own penalty. Blasphemy is infidelity in a rage ; and the rage is commonly produced by futile repression. Voltaire blasphemed furiously in France ; in England he conceived the greatest respect for the religion of the Quakers.

Obscenity is a widely different thing from blasphemy ; as a rule it is both easily identified and a fit subject for repression. None but bad motives can possibly be assigned for it. There are, however, certain cases, not so much of obscenity as of immorality, or what the world has hitherto deemed such, with which it is more difficult to deal, and about which there has been trouble in the United States. We refer to such books as that of Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant, treating on novel, and to people in general, shocking principles, subjects connected with the relations between the sexes. It is possible in these cases to assign a good motive, and even to imagine that repression may

stifle some beneficent, though at first sight, strange and revolting truths. Something may depend on the language in which the moral doctrines are couched and the manner in which they are disseminated, whether by submitting them to science or thrusting them into the hands of ignorance, frailty, and youth. But the very case we have mentioned proves that the presumption is practically in favour of letting these things alone. Mrs. Besant's book, if let alone, would probably have gone silently to its grave: but when the Society for the Suppression of Vice took it in hand, its sale became immense, and during the days of the trial, you could not walk through the streets of London without having it thrust by peddlers into your hands. The suppressors of vice will say that it is a matter of principle; but no principle that is itself sound can require us to aggravate an evil.

The law is now being invoked at New York for the suppression of Zola's novels, "L'Assommoir" and "Nana." Our own power of eating carrion being limited, we cannot say that we have read "L'Assommoir" and "Nana;" but we have read enough of them to know pretty well what they are. They seem not to be exactly obscene or even immoral; at least there is nothing in them calculated to inflame the passions. They are simply loathsome. Go into the filthiest alley you can find in New York, pace slowly along it, observing intently each disgusting object, sniffing deliberately each foul smell, and you will have a good notion of "L'Assommoir" and "Nana." M. Zola's speciality as an artist seems to us to be his faculty of distinguishing all the elements of a composite stench and presenting each, with the delectable source of it, vividly to the reader's mind. People who have a taste for bathing in a cesspool, cannot be made much dirtier by being allowed to do it. To prosecute is to advertise; to advertise in far the most effectual way of all.

—The great philosophical controversy still rages along the whole line, and the question whether life is worth living has lost none of its interest. The very existence of the debate

marks a new era. For the first time in his history, man, in the full light of science and historical philosophy, is meditating on his own estate. A butterfly would have been as likely to consider whether its life was worth living, as man in more primitive times. The question evidently does not admit of a simple answer. Are we under a moral government, and will virtue have its reward? If so, a good life is worth living, though, from a worldly point of view, it may be "the weariest and most loathed that age, ache, penury and imprisonment, can lay on nature." If we are not under a moral government, and if virtue, missing its reward here, has no reward hereafter, we are thrown back upon a calculation of the balance between happiness and unhappiness in each individual life. To talk of human life in the aggregate is absurd. Is the man free, healthy, prosperous, capable of intellectual enjoyment, surrounded by affection? Or is he a slave, a leper, penniless, an outcast, without any one to love or care for him in the world? Then come subtle questions as to the effect likely to be produced on our happiness by the cravings and sensibilities which mental culture generates, and again, by the increasingly vivid perception of the approach of death. What is certain, unfortunately, is that there are a good many people to whom their lives do not seem worth living, for suicide is decidedly on the increase. Nor is it easy to see on what ground it can be prohibited by Agnostics. A Theist may say that a man ought not to leave his post, but then the Theist believes in a Commander. To talk of self-murder in a legal sense is preposterous; we might as well talk of self-theft. An Agnostic editor of a scientific periodical, attacking Mr. Mallock, thinks he has floored him by saying that a man is bound to preserve his life because it has cost so much to develop it out of protoplasm through a long ascending series of animal forms. Cost whom? The Agnostic editor of the scientific periodical? It would be idle, we fear, to deny that there are men who cannot rationally look forward to anything like so much pleasure as pain for the remainder of their lives. If there is a canon fixed by the Al-

mighty against self-slaughter, reason will bid them exercise fortitude; but otherwise what is to prevent them from making their escape?

—The Church may return to the Theatre, but if she retains any moral influence, it is to be hoped she will not go to the Trapeze. "The great sensation of the century, a human being shot from a monster cannon, and caught by a lady hanging head downwards on the lofty trapeze. Zuila, the female Blondin, whose wonderful feats in crossing the high wire, sixty feet in mid-air and blindfolded; also with her feet encased in sacks and riding a velocipede over the high wire, sixty feet in mid-air, have been the sensation of Paris and the continent, appears in her incredible performance at each exhibition." Such are the delights provided for a Christian and civilized community. On the whole, humanity would rather prefer the prize-fight which was going on about the same time. Truly is the exhibition called in the programme a "sensation." There is nothing in it graceful or amusing. The whole attraction consists in the thrill of vile emotion produced by the sight of a danger which the spectator does not share. When Blondin, at the Crystal Palace, performed on the high rope at the peril of his life, there were forty thousand spectators; when he performed on the low rope feats fully as marvellous, but without peril to his life, there were only five thousand. There could be no doubt, in that case, what was the enjoyment. The Trapeze is the gladiatorial show, or the bull-fight, in a mitigated form. The brutality becomes more hateful when the victim is a woman, and flagrantly criminal when the victim is a child. No doubt practice has greatly steeled the nerves of these unfortunates; but the nerves even of an acrobat must be sometimes shaken by bad health; and we may be sure that the air of gay confidence with which the perilous rope is mounted not seldom conceals the quiverings of mortal fear. Slavery has been abolished, but a human being compelled daily to risk life or limb for the

amusement of a vulgar crowd, though he may have a vote and be nominally his own master, is not the least unhappy or the least abused of slaves.

—Among current events a place must certainly be given to the defeat of Hanlan—Hanlan's "Waterloo," as it is styled, in keeping with the general grandeur of this farce. There does not seem to us to be any reason for questioning the Champion's honesty, which has hitherto been unimpeached, or for refusing to admit into the authentic annals of history the fact that at the turning point of the race he had a stitch in his side, an occurence familiar enough to the unathletic, though it was supposed that training exempted the athlete from the little sanitary accidents which visit weak humanity. But we seem to be pretty nearly alone in our simple faith. The general opinion of the leading journals is embodied in the words of the *New York World*: "That gallant and straightforward oarsman, Hanlan, appears to have behaved at Providence yesterday very much as that cowardly and perfidious oarsman Courtney behaved at Washington a few weeks ago. They all row one way and look another." There is nothing like this in Pindar. He never says that all the Charioteers at Olympia drive one way and look another. Decidedly if "Sport" is, as we are often told, a revival of the Greek games, it is a revival with a modern improvement. The athletes of Greece were really amateurs: they were members of a leisure class which spent its time in war or in such exercises as formed a training school for wars—a class of gentlemen —and therefore they were satisfied with the olive or parsley crown, and never, so far as we know, sold a race. So long as sports are in the hands of amateurs, all is well. With the professional invariably comes the black-leg.

—Exception is taken by the *Dominion Churchman*, the special organ we believe of the Anglican clergy, to our statement that the exclusive pretensions of the Church of England in this coun-

rty were probably as much social as ecclesiastical, and might be called a continuation of the feelings of the English gentry towards Dissenters. We can have no desire to fix on anyone a sentiment which he disclaims, though in the very next column we find a defence of "Lord" Bishop, a title which, whatever else it may be, is assuredly a mark of social pride. Perhaps the feeling of social superiority is stronger in the laity, that of ecclesiastical superiority in the clergy. Be the special source, however, what it may, there can be no sort of doubt as to the general nature of the emotion with which the writer of the article in question looks down on those whom he is pleased to call "Dissenters" and "Nonconformists." "If," he says, "Dissenters choose to pipe, we will not listen, much less dance. If they become insolently abusive, we must get out of hearing as far as we can. We have no time to play with them, we neither love nor hate them, we reserve our feelings for worthier objects in both kinds." He warns them off with "henceforth let no man trouble us, we bear in our body the marks of the Lord Jesus." Those Churchmen who show any sympathy with Dissenters are compared to "freethinkers and free-lovers." "Dissenter," we apprehend, has reference to a State Church; "Nonconformist" to the Act of Uniformity; and neither State Church nor Act of Uniformity exist in Canada. The largest Episcopal Church by far, and the most ancient in the Dominion, is the Roman Catholic, which is, in fact, still established in Quebec; and from this, if there is any such thing as dissent in the case, the Anglicans are Dissenters. However, we respect all convictions, strongly persuaded though we are that, in preaching isolation, the *Dominion Churchman*, though it may borrow a phrase from St. Paul, would not have the Apostle of the Gentiles on its side. Acrimonious discussions on these subjects can do no good. We have only to say that if, as we suppose, there are in the Episcopal Church, Protestants who do not hold themselves to be severed by any thing essential from other Protestant Churches, they have a duty to perform. It is clearly incumbent, and urgently incumbent on them, to struggle against

a spirit of isolation and mutual aversion which, as they must see, adds not a little to the mortal peril in which religion is now placed. If exclusion is a matter of principle to him who believes in it, so also is comprehension. The interchange of pulpits which took place among the churches the other day was worth a good many "Aids to Faith" of the controversial kind. A clergy may be pious and devoted, yet wanting in breadth of mind. The Anglican clergy in England has struggled hard to keep "Dissenters" out of their political rights and out of the national places of education; it is now struggling to keep them out of the national burying places, with the worst consequences to the Church herself in each case, as her wisest friends clearly see.

—Mr. Herbert Spencer's "Ceremonial Institutions" contains a curious collection of facts, and many ingenious explanations of modern ceremonies, as disguised relics of primordial habits, though the theory seems to us to be overstrained when the perfectly natural custom of shaking hands is interpreted as a surviving symbol of military submission. But the general position that ceremony alone is primordial, and that from it sprung politics on one side and religion on the other, appears to us, we must say, as strange as anything can be in itself and wholly unsustained by the evidence. Mr. Spencer constantly asserts as an undoubted and almost self-evident fact, that religion has its origin in the reverence of the savage for the ghosts or doubles of departed chiefs, or other mighty and elevated personages, who continued to receive, after their death, the same homage which they had received in life. Going to church, according to him, is a morning call upon a dead potentate, to whose court you would have gone to pay the same mark of respect when he was living. We can hardly refrain from calling this nonsense. It is totally at variance with all that we know of the history of religion. "In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth;" this may be true, or it may not; but what in the

world has it to do, by what imaginable filiation can it be connected, with reverence for chiefs, as for their doubles? It is, on every hypothesis, a conception of the origin of the Universe and of Man, and of the relations of both to a higher power. The same may be said even of the coarsest and wildest mythologies. Jupiter is not a dead chief; nor can he possibly be identified with one; he is the god of the sky. If the philosopher can succeed in tracing the evolution of Christianity from ceremonial observances paid to the doubles of chiefs, the feat of manufacturing moonbeams out of cucumbers will surely have been performed. Mr. Spencer seems to admit the subsequent infusion into religion of a moral element. He will, perhaps, explain in a future volume how this infusion takes place, and why it is that the remnant of an obsolete and half-animal ceremonialism, instead of dying out with the brutish superstition that gave it birth, all at once puts on a higher character, gains immensely in power, and produces so considerable a phenomenon as Christendom. In the confidence with which Mr. Herbert Spencer propounds a view so thoroughly crude and unhistorical we see a warning against committing ourselves too unreservedly to the prevailing current of thought. Let us have a little patience and see how these things will work out. Exclusive physicists have their bias as well as exclusive theologians or metaphysicians, and are by that bias prevented from being infallible guides. Science has laughed over attempts to deal with astronomical and geological questions by the principles of theology; perhaps the day may come when a more comprehensive science will laugh at attempts to settle questions of morality and religion by the principles of mechanics.

One most important fact is brought, we think, distinctly into view by the ethical philosophy of Mr. Spencer. There can be no belief in right and wrong, apart from pleasure and expediency, without belief in a God; while, conversely, a belief in God is involved in the belief in right and wrong. Moral good and evil, virtue and vice, are in short to Materialism unmeaning words. Is the action or the course of action conducive or not

conducive to the prolongation and enjoyment of life? No other question than this can the materialist ask, no other reason than that which the answer to this question supplies has he for perferring one sort of conduct or one character to another. Moral emotion in him is out of place, and doubly out of place since he is a necessarian, and must hold that no man, in the given circumstances, could possibly act otherwise then as he does. Mr. Spencer, we have said, is as far as possible from renouncing moral emotion: even in the midst of his scientific reasoning, his indignation against wrong blazes out in the most fiery manner. But this, if we go to the root of it, proves that the philosopher lives still in the penumbra of superstition, or, if he will, of ceremonialism, and has not yet divested himself of belief in a God, or in something which, if analysed, would be found to imply the existence of God.

So at least it appears to us; but a writer in the *Canadian Monthly*, who is a disciple of Mr. Spencer (and one of whom Mr. Spencer has the greatest reason to be proud), undertakes to vindicate his teacher's consistency. "Mr. Spencer's indignation," he says, "is the measure of his own moral development, and signifies his instinctive recoil from courses of conduct which show the moral sense in a very backward state. Even when we understand how bad actions have come to be performed, and are prepared to make allowances for the perpretrators, we shrink from and denounce them none the less. We surely should allow the philosophers some common human privileges." We are most willing to allow philosophers common human privileges, even to the extent of permitting the editors of scientific journals to be hurried by their indignation against necessary error into treating with coarse discourtesy those whose views happen not to be the same as their own. We only claim the right to interpret phenomena, including those which seem to indicate that common sense and feeling in a theorist's breast rebel against his theory. There are things not dreamed of in Mr. Spencer's philosophy yet discernible in Mr. Spencer. We submit that the passages to which we referred in

his "Data of Ethics" will not bear the construction which his disciple puts upon them. They appear to us most distinctly to imply that the persons whose acts move the writer's indignation are to be reprobated for not having done otherwise than they did; for having broken a moral law which they ought to have kept, and fallen short of a moral standard which they ought to have reached; and this is an assumption which it is surely impossible to reconcile with Necessarianism or with thoroughgoing-Evolution. As to the statement that we denounce bad actions none the less when we are prepared to make allowance for the perpetrators, we cannot accept it as consistent with experience. Surely the fact is that as often as we know that allowance ought to be made, we proportionally reduce the measure of our denunciation, and that this is one of the proofs of our general belief in free will, and in moral responsibility as connected with it, whether that belief be an illusion or not.

The writer in the *Canadian Monthly* concludes his defence of Mr. Spencer by saying, "there is great edification in the thought, now brought home to our understanding, that by every truly moral act we help to build up and improve the life of the world and make ourselves co-workers with the principle of life everywhere." It cannot be here meant that the idea of our contributing by every moral act to the building up of the moral life of the world, and thus to the attainment of ultimate perfection and felicity, is now for the first time brought home to our understandings: such an assertion would call down a shower of citations from the New Testament and Christian writers. The idea now for the first time brought home to our understandings must be that mere life has a self-evident and indefeasible claim to our devotion and allegiance, such as has hitherto been assigned to the Deity, and is capable of inspiring, sustaining, and rewarding effort and self-sacrifice in the same way. But what is Life? What right have we, from the scientific point of view, to turn it into an abstract entity and erect the service of it into a principle? To the eye of science it is nothing more than an aggregate—the aggregate of the lives of good beings and wicked,

of happy beings and unhappy; of men, beasts, reptiles and insects; of Mr. Spencer, and of the sheep, whom in the shape of roast mutton, Mr. Spencer eats. Science would perhaps find it difficult even to give a precise reason for regarding the later development as higher than the earlier. Complexity, in itself, seems no object of veneration. Then come Schopenhauer and Hartmann, with a numerous train of followers, besides the five hundred millions of Buddhists, and tell you, on the undeniably scientific ground of their own experience, that Life, so far from having a self-evident and indefeasible claim to our devotion and allegiance and being entitled to mount the vacant throne of Deity, is the Universal Evil, and that to put an end to it by annihilating will, which is its source and sustenance, is the sum of all practical philosophy. We are not upholding any system or dogma, theological, or of any other kind. We know too well that at this time clouds and darknes rest on the Estate of Man. But we are not able to persuade ourselves that they are likely to be removed by Mr. Herbert Spencer, though we have the greatest respect for him as an earnest and patient seeker after truth. His mechanical philosophy of history appears to us to bear no relation to the facts, to which, in truth, he has never attempted to apply it; his account of the origin of religion, we maintain to be equally baseless; and though there is much that is valuable in his "Data of Ethics," we cannot think that the grand problem is there solved. Suppose a man to have dedicated his life almost entirely to physical science, and to have paid far less attention to history, to literature, to moral philosophy, and generally to the study of humanity, is not this theory of Ethics, as the science of prolonging life and making it enjoyable, precisely the theory he would be likely to frame?

One word, if our readers will endure it, on the Necessarian question, which, to so great an extent, lies at the bottom of all these controversies. It appears to us that Jonathan Edwards is undoubtedly right in maintaining that there is a connection between every human action and its antecedents, and that he gains a complete triumph over those who deny that connection

and maintain that the will acts, in any case, without inclining motives, and, as it were, in a vacuum. But the nature of the connection remains a mystery. We learn its existence not from inspection but from consciousness, and this same consciousness tells us that the connection is not such as to preclude the existence of liberty of choice, moral aspiration, moral effort, moral responsibility, which are the contradictories of Necessarianism. The terms *cause and effect*, and others of the same kind, which the defect of psychological language compels us to use in speaking of the mental connection between action and its antecedents, are steeped, from their employment in connection with physical science, in physical association, and they import with them into the moral sphere the notion of physical enchainment, for which the representations of consciousness, the sole authority, afford no warrant whatever. We commend this to the consideration of Necessarians like Professor Huxley, who, though they have never had, any more than the rest of us, the opportunity of inspecting the connection of a human action with its motive, have sufficient confidence in their own exact knowledge of it to pronounce dogmatically that man is an automaton—an automaton which automatically fancied itself possessed of volition, but has now automatically come to the conviction that it is an automaton and nothing else. Once more, it is early to decide; we are in the midst of a freshet of discovery in physical science which may well have taken people off their feet for the time; let us not be too cocksure.

—The fate of Jonathan Edwards is a warning to writers on religious philosophy against writing with any object but truth. The object of Jonathan Edwards was not truth; it was to construct a philosophic defence of the Calvinistic dogma. He saw plainly enough whither the doctrine of Predestination led—that it presented the Deity as visiting with eternal tortures in the persons of his creatures the Evil of which He was Himself the Author—and nothing can be more pitiable than the sophistry

with which he tries to reconcile the moral sense of his readers to that hideous and revolting conclusion. Nemesis has now made him an involuntary apostle of Materialism, the adherents of which appeal to his "iron-linked and indissoluble chain" of reasoning as the conclusive demonstration of the nullity of the will, and the complete subjection of human action to the laws of matter. His doom has been shared by Dean Mansel, the writer of the famous Bampton Lectures on the "Limits of Religious Thought," a work which having been intended to destroy Rational Religion in the interest of Anglican orthodoxy, or rather of Toryism, and having been hailed with loud applause by the Anglicans, now furnishes Agnostics with metaphysical proofs of the impossibility of believing in God. Leading Agnostic writers have even incorporated into their works Dean Mansel's demonstration of their fundamental position, with the qualifying remark that he is, in truth, too severely Agnostic, and does not sufficiently recognise the existence in the human mind of a natural reverence for the unknown. He cut off his own legs in attempting to make Reason slay herself with her own sword.

—Among other signs of ethical change, we note that, at Dublin, a distinguished lecturer, if he be rightly reported, has been electrifying an audience of youths, and scandalizing their sires by telling them, in a lecture on the "Life of Goethe," that it is better to contribute in some brilliant way to the development of Humanity, than to keep the commonplace and traditional laws of morals. The consequences are likely to be some brilliant contributions to the development of humanity, in the shape of tavern suppers and breakings of lamps. But who is it that feels so sure that the decay of religious belief will in no way affect morality? As to Goethe, he was the very type of an artist, who lived for art and for art alone, neither duty nor affection disputed the empire of the beautiful in his breast. He was, and had elaborately trained himself to be, a sort

of Olympian statue of cultivated self-complacency. Without the faintest misgiving he sacrificed women to his fancy. The agonies of his country prostrate beneath the French invader affected him not in the slightest degree. The French were attractive people; and what were the sufferings of Germany to the sublime Goethe? Not only did he eagerly drink in compliments from the tyrant; he eagerly received baubles from him, and even, as one of the most eulogistic of biographers is fain to confess, set upon the baubles rather an extraordinary value. Mr. Lewes tries to repel criticism with a *tu quoque*. "It does seem to me," he says "that sneers at his (Goethe's) title and epigrams on his stars, come with a very bad grace from a nation which is laughed at for nothing more frequently than for its inordinate love of titles." But this is not the point. It is not of flunkeyism that Goethe has been accused so much as of callous and selfish indifference to the wrongs with which the national heart was bleeding, and which were soon to call everything that was generous and chivalrous in Germany to arms. The truth is that here within a mighty frame of intellect dwelt a soul very far less grand. The science of ethics is a practical science; by its fruits it, or anything tendered as an improvement of it, must be judged. To assure us that we are entering on a better era, we must see a higher and more beneficent type of character than the old faith has produced. Voltaire will not do; Rousseau will not do; nor, as we think, will Goethe.

THE BYSTANDER.

AUGUST, 1880.

THE voice of the country has been heard, and the Prime Minister has gone to England, taking the Minister of Railways with him, to transfer the Pacific Road to a private Company. This is decisive. After the admission implied in such a step, it will be impossible ever to throw back the burden and danger on the country. Here is the end of the Pacific Railway as a Government enterprise. Are there a hundred people in the Dominion, saving contractors and contract-mongers, who do not in their hearts rejoice?

Our deliverance from Government contracts and their pestilent influence is almost as great a cause of rejoicing as our deliverance from the mad undertaking itself. We may say so without casting an aspersion on any particular Government. No Government, however honest, can control the powers of mischief which are called into activity by contracting on a large scale. The army and navy contracts in England, at the time of the war with France, were sources of jobbing and corruption as prolific as the contracts of the same description in the United States, or Railway contracts here. Look at Mr. Sandford Fleming's letter declining the Chief Engineership of the Intercolonial. He says he would have to investigate unsettled claims amounting to several millions. What an opening for corruption is here! When the scene of operations is distant, and not under the eye of the Government, the danger cannot fail to be increased. The very names of some of the men who are active

in connection with the North-West are enough to prove that corruption is abroad. There must be a carcass, and a pretty putrid one, where such birds are gathered together. Even to us materials for creating a sensation on the subject of contracts have come; but there is no use in creating a sensation; what we want is to see the source of the evil extinguished. Of the dangers which threaten free institutions on this continent, there is hardly one greater than the corruption which waits on public works.

There are two things of which the country will wish to be assured—that it is entirely rid of the whole undertaking, of the running as well as of the construction; and that the company is completely and finally severed from the Government, so that there may be no playing of the two into each other's hands, and we may not be ruled by a colossal Lobby. Sir John Macdonald, no doubt, hopes to reserve land enough to indemnify the nation for past expenditure. It will, of course, be borne in mind that a single railroad only opens up the line of country through which it passes, and that land reserved at a distance from it, without branch lines, is of little value.

Manitoba, as we learn from trustworthy informants on the spot, is not filling at the rate which sanguine calculators expected. The Opposition will throw the blame on the Land Regulations. But the illimitable wilderness, with its great attractions, has also disadvantages—remoteness, present scarcity of fuel, and a climate which may be exhilarating to the robust, the well-fed and the well-clothed, but stops industry during the greater part of the year.

Whatever is to be done for us by negotiation, the address of Sir John Macdonald will do. He is more worthily employed in this than in sitting umpire over a sordid chaos of conflicting claims for small places. There is no one who can cast a stone at him for not sacrificing the interest, nay the solvency, of the country to the obstinacy which folly calls consistency. We are all in the same boat, and alike ready to bury the past, if we can be rid of the national incubus for the future. With

commercial enterprise nobody would think of interfering, though it were to project a railway to the North Pole.

—It was hardly reasonable to expect that Mr. Blake and Mr. Mackenzie would say anything important about politics at the dinner of the National Club. In the first place, they might by so doing, have "waked with war-cry the wassail hour;" the club containing members of all shades of opinion, to some of whom any sentiment strongly expressed would have been offensive. In the second place, it was not likely either that Mr. Mackenzie could unbosom himself before Mr. Blake, or that Mr. Blake would unbosom himself before Mr. Mackenzie. A more delicate operation could not be imagined than a public interchange of ideas on the policy of the Opposition between the old and the new leader. Each just indicated his position. Through the speech of Mr. Mackenzie there ran an undertone of sorrow over the inability of the old shrivelled wine-skin of Gritism to hold the new wine of Liberal opinion. Mr. Blake intimated his sympathy with bolder councils, though under the usual form of advocating Imperial Federation. A surrender of self-government, in return for an almost nominal representation, which would be rendered still more ineffective by the influence of London Society on the representatives of the Colonies; acceptance of a share in the burden of Imperial taxation for the maintenance of the Federal armaments; full and direct participation in wars made for objects utterly remote from Canadian interests, by a diplomacy over which Canada would have no control—such, all must see, would be the certain consequences to us of Imperial Federation. Is Mr. Blake prepared for them? We cannot believe that he is, or that he means anything more than that the present situation cannot last, and that he is ready for a change. But the Admiral must not make false signals. Besides, Mr. Blake may be entrapped. Had Lord Beaconsfield remained in office and carried his schemes into effect, he would have been sure to quote

in a paper proposing Imperial Federation the language of a colonial statesman so distinguished as Mr. Blake.

The Liberal party has plenty of life and hope in it. Two things prevent it from marching—a leader who does not thoroughly know his own mind, and an organ in the hands of very narrow and rancorous Tories, whose general tendencies are not altered though they may be forced to pay tribute to Liberalism on particular questions such as that of the reform of the Senate.

—We have been taken to task for repeating the statement that the Government was about to advance the passage money of a large body of navvies to work on the Pacific Railway. The statement was part of the Cable news, and it seemed to us to be confirmed rather than contradicted by the explanations of some of the Government journals. Nobody can suppose that we wish to do injustice to the Government. We only wish that it should go right and not wrong. Once more we register the admission that its Anti-Continental policy has been in accordance with established tradition and general sentiment, and that the policy which we have ourselves supported has been at variance with both, though with general sentiment we believe it is at variance no longer.

The Cable is again to blame, if we are mistaken in supposing that conferences have been held between our High Commissioner and the representatives of the Australian Colonies, with a view to some change in the relation of the Colonies to the Mother Country. Something in the nature both of an Imperial Zollverein and of an Imperial Emigration League seems to be still afloat; the special object of the Emigration League being to divert the stream of emigration from the United States to British Dependencies. We are sick, and we believe everybody is sick, of debating these questions in the abstract. We cannot conceive a tariff in which all the Colonies, with their great diversity of industrial interests and

trade relations, would acquiesce, and for the sake of which they would be content to resign for ever their powers of commercial legislation. As to the other question, we believe that the High Commissioner is about as likely to succeed in diverting the migration of birds, and inducing the feathered wanderers to confine themselves to countries under the British flag, as he is to succeed in inducing the English, still more the Irish, peasant to abstain, on political grounds, from going to the country where he thinks he can earn most bread. The question will also arise, how the emigration is to be distributed among Colonies which have hitherto been carrying on a competition, and in the case of New Zealand, cut-throat competition with each other. But it is needless to discuss projects which have never assumed a definite form. Let the plan be framed, and we shall see whether it is likely to work. In the meantime, can anything be imagined more absurd than a scheme for promoting and subsidizing emigration from England to Canada, while Canada is losing her own people by tens of thousands? The emigration policy wanted, so far as we are concerned, is one which will keep Canadians at home.

Among the Australians with whom Sir A. Galt confers, no doubt, is Sir Julius Vogel, lately Prime Minister of New Zealand, now High Commissioner (we believe that is his title) for the Colony, and the paragon of highflying Imperialism of all kinds. But the brilliant reputation of Sir Julius is at this moment obscured by a passing cloud. From New Zealand comes a cry of distress. Sir Julius has piled up a public debt amounting, according to a correspondent of the London *Times*, to $150,000,000, for a population, according to the last census (1879), of 414,412 whites, including Chinese, half-castes and persons on ship-board*; while in the last budget the deficit was nearly $5,000,000. Of course, while the money was being spent, there were fine times, and Sir Julius Vogel was a heaven-born statesman; he is now regarded as "too sanguine

*See Stateman's Year Book, p. 739.

and ambitious." It is evidently a case of incurring liabilities on the strength of latent resources. Resources which are latent are, for financial purposes, non-existent; they can be called forth from their latent condition only by the influx of settlers, and settlers will not flow into a country where they have to shoulder an enormous debt. Mortgaging for improvements pays of course within limits; but not when carried to the extent of actual embarrassment.

—There can scarcely be any doubt as to the growth of a feeling in favour of Commercial Union or the removal, under whatever name may be preferred, of the Customs' line between us and the rest of the Continent. .Mr. Perrault addresses large and enthusiastic meetings in Quebec where the attempt to create a division in favour of partial Reciprocity is as ineffectual as the attempt to put down discussion by the use of foul language here. Were this a political movement the issue might be uncertain; unless the grievance is very great, political movements often reach a certain point and then die away. But economical movements which concern the bread of the people, if there is real reason for them, very seldom die away. Commercial Union will come. There will be fluctuations of opinion, as there always are, when a great change is in view. Adverse forces, political, commercial and sentimental, will develop themselves when the political crisis approaches. The wave will recede, and its retreat will be taken by superficial observers for the ebb of the tide. But the tide will not ebb. It is highly probable that the decisive protest against the continuance of the Customs' line will come from that very North-West, the incorporation of which was to give new life and substance to the Anti-Continental system. The London *Advertiser*, which is now practically the leading journal of the Liberal party, is favourable to Commercial Union. The Hamilton *Times* is against it, evidently fearing that it would injure the Canadian manufacturer, who, as we believe, would, on the contrary, gain by

admission to the larger market more than he would lose by the competition. But in the press, as among the people, the movement appears decidedly to advance. The *Globe*, of course, continues to prove in one column that Free Trade is the only road to wealth, and in the next that Free Trade with our neighbours would be the road to ruin. When the commercial union of Scotland with England was proposed, the great Scotch orator of the day, Lord Belhaven, described with apocalyptic eloquence the woe which was sure to come—the Scotch artizan "drinking water instead of ale, and eating his saltless porridge," the Scotch ploughman "seeing his grain spoil upon his lands, cursing the day of his birth, and dreading the expense of his burial." The orator even asked the leave of the House to pause in his speech while he dropped a tear over his ruined country. It is a pity the tear could not be preserved, as a memorial of political foresight, at Glasgow or Dundee.

Public attention continues to be attracted to these subjects by the exodus to the States. This, according to some writers, arises purely from the action of a mysterious tide of population, swayed by the influence of some commercial moon. The tide of population, however, unlike the ocean tide, appears to ebb without flowing; at least, we have not recently heard of people rushing by tens of thousands from the United States into Canada. Besides, what power causes the waters to observe so closely a certain political line, which corresponds with no commercial boundary, for Sir Leonard Tilley finds it necessary to impose a protective coal tax, in order to create an artificial privity of interest between the Maritime Provinces and Ontario. To say that the N. P. has driven all the people out of the country, is preposterous: the N. P., a mere adjustment of new taxes in themselves unavoidable, cannot have produced a very great effect one way or other, and perfectly trustworthy judges are of opinion that on the whole the effect has been good. The cause is the atrophy which would be produced if a tenth part of England or France were cut off by a Customs' line from the rest; and this Commerce and the people are beginning to see, though

the politicians may as yet think it expedient to shut their eyes.

That people talk about these matters more and with greater freedom in private than in public is very true. The *Journal of Commerce* is astonished at our thinking that opinion in Canada has not been free; we are astonished at our able contemporary's astonishment. Tyranny may be exercised over reputation as well as over person or property: it has been exercised over reputation by powerful journals in this country to an extreme degree, as well as with the utmost unscrupulousness, and only with difficulty put down. Men to whom no interested motive could be imputed, who were advocating in a perfectly legitimate way what they believed to be good for the people, have been treated by those who had got the control of opinion as malefactors and traitors, held up not only to political but to social odium, and hunted down almost like noxious beasts. The tyranny was not only fatal to the openness of national councils, on questions that concerned the nation most deeply but injurious to national character. Perhaps at Montreal, where the *Journal of Commerce* is published, there has been more of liberality and tolerance than under the Calvinistic dictatorship in Ontario. Another thing that has interfered, and still interferes, if not with freedom of opinion, with the free profession of opinion by the people in the elections—is the rigidity of party organization. The *Journal of Commerce* challenges the adherents of Commercial Union to appeal to the people under the Ballot. But how are they to get nominations? The nominations are completely controlled by the managers of the two organized parties, and an independent candidate attempting to appeal to the people in favour of a new principle, would, as the *Journal of Commerce* must know, expose his principle to defeat by agencies irrespective not only of its truth, but of the sentiment of the people. In the United States, an immense majority of the citizens may be safely said to be in favour of Administrative Reform, which the two "Machines" are practically in collusion with each other to prevent; but no

independent candidate would dream of running as a champion of Administrative Reform. This in fact is a weak point in all elective institutions to which political architects will have to look carefully in the future. Opinion works its way nevertheless; and those who do not want seats in Parliament, or anything else that it is in the power of politicians to give or withhold, may be well content patiently to watch, and as far as they can, help its progress. At the last general election, thousands of the people went across the party lines to vote for the N. P.; we shall see whether, at the next general election, they will do anything of the same kind.

—By the recurrence of the Glorious Twelfth everybody is once more set asking what is Orangeism ? and still no answer is found. What Orangeism was in Ireland at the time of the Battle of the Boyne is clear enough. But what is it in Canada, a land of perfect religious equality, at the present day? Against whom and what are the Orangemen banded together? Hardly against their old enemies the Roman Catholics; for here Roman Catholic and Orangeman often vote together on the Tory side. Fenianism and the Fenian raids may perhaps have revived for a moment the original reason for association; but nobody, we suppose, in Canada is afraid of Fenianism now. Antagonism to the United States, again, can scarcely be the explanation, because in the United States there are Orange Lodges, the members of which are, of course, good citizens of the country to which they belong. Probably the solution is to be found in the broader tendencies of human nature, in the love of combination and secrecy for their own sake, in fondness for titles, costume, and parade. The love of combination is apt to be particularly strong where, as in these democracies of the New World, the general texture of society is somewhat loose. Essentially, perhaps, Orangeism may be classed with Freemasonry and Odd-fellowship. Unluckily while Freemasonry and Odd-fellowship are purely social and benevolent, Orangeism is poli-

tical and antagonistic, vague and shadowy as the antagonism may be: it lends itself to the purposes of faction, and interferes with the independence and the broad duties of the citizen. It is particularly objectionable in this country on account of its local adjunct of Young Britonism, which is likely enough some day to be the source of serious trouble. To trepan boys, before they have had a chance of fairly forming their opinions, into a political club, and to cultivate in them a spirit of estrangement from their fellow citizens, is wrong, and it is a pity that the practice cannot be prohibited by law. There are two Lodges, to one of which all of us, to the other most of us, belong—the State and the Church—which between them would seem to afford full scope for the social tendencies and energies of every one, however gregarious he may be. If a man wants any closer bond, or a bond that brings with it more banners, insignia, and suppers, let it be like that of the Freemasons and the Odd-fellows, a bond of good fellowship and good will.

— A spirited manifesto has been put forth by the Working-men's Liberal Conservative Union of Toronto, complaining that the working men have been "the dupes of professional wirepullers and party tricksters, to be used at pleasure on certain occasions and afterwards thrown aside." Nothing is more certain; and it may be added that a "Working-men's Liberal Conservative Union" is precisely the same kind of thing in England that it is here. Why should the working-man allow himself to be penned into any sheepfold by any shepherd? Industrially, he must have his trade-unions, or other associations, for the promotion of his special interests; but politically he is a member of the community, and on election days he ought to be that and that alone. Let him preserve his individual independence, make up his own mind, and cast a patriotic vote, in his own interest and that of his family, for the policy which he believes to be best for the country; resting assured, as he may, that the policy which is best for the country is best for every man, wo-

man and child in it. If he will not do this, he will be bought and sold; bought with lying flattery, or worse, with appeals to social envy and malignity, then sold behind his back for what he will fetch in place and pelf. The men who try to keep him apart from the rest of the community, and pretend to lead him for special objects of his own, if they are not wire-pullers of the common kind, are vote-jobbers: they get the working-man's vote into their pockets, and then they run over to a Minister and ask him how much he will give them for it. Their vaunted independence is a way of keeping up their price. Let the working-man bid them go and, like himself, ply honest trades. If he wants leaders on any special occasion, let him at least take those whose objects are above suspicion. After what he has seen, his credulity is astonishing. Independence of party is excellent; and the artisan may become a power of inestimable value in our politics if he will steadfastly support those statesmen, and those only, who, without regard to U. E. fancies, or any other fancies, do to the best of their ability what will secure to labour its fair reward, and bring wealth, happiness and the virtue which goes along with them into his home and those of the Canadian people. His freedom from the fetters of tradition and convention is likely also to make him a specially fearless champion of that liberty of discussion which we are glad to see our new contemporary, the *Commonwealth*, make a vital article of its creed. But a class which severs its interest from that of the community at large is an amputated limb; and if the amputation is bad for the body for the limb it is much worse. Independent candidatures, though they may be forlorn hopes, we shall hail with pleasure, but we trust they will be independent of class and special interests as well as of party.

—Bennett has paid the penalty of a life of low dissipation. His homicidal and suicidal reveries, committed to writing in the maddest form and carried about on his person, are conclu-

sive proof that, at the time of committing the act for which he was condemned, he was a proper inmate for an asylum. He most likely entered Mr. Brown's room with a demoniacal impulse in his shattered mind, but without any fixed purpose; and had Mr. Brown only been aware of the mental state of his visitor, it is possible that by studious calmness and gentleness he might have conjured the fiend for the moment, and his life might have been saved. But insanity, brought on by bad habits, was criminal; as perhaps is not a little of that which fills our asylums. Bennett went into the dock with the rope round his neck; for writers, not meaning to do anything wrong, yet, as we think, rather forgetting what is due to a prisoner awaiting his trial, had been all along calling him the murderer and the assassin. Little weight could be attached to any of his maunderings, even when he was speaking in the presence of death; but there was nothing incredible in his statement that his pistol would have been drawn only in irresolute menace, had not his hand been seized and a scuffle ensued. The wound evidently was not in itself mortal. With regard to this part of his defence, the prisoner seems to have suffered from his destitute condition, which prevented his commanding all the medical evidence that his Counsel would have desired. An application to the Government for pecuniary assistance was refused; no doubt unavoidably: yet it seems hardly consistent with the interests of justice that any accused person, especially one on trial for his life, should be left without the means of producing all that is requisite in his defence. There was nothing redeeming in Bennett's case; nor was there anything touching, except, perhaps, that he was so complete a type of the castaway. Nothing linked him to society or society to him. To the question whether life is worth living, he replied, so far as he was concerned, by begging that the day of his execution might be hastened. Not the faintest sign of sympathy attended his tragic exit from the scene. It appears that as a child he was thrown on the world an orphan, and we can easily imagine what the world was to him. Circumstance is not all, but it often makes the difference between the

castaway who comes to the gallows and the highly respectable rogue who comes to reward and honour. Once more we may say, "There, but for the Grace of God—but for a good home, happy surroundings, and the influence of affection—goes Richard Baxter."

—It was just after going to press with our last number that we were favoured with a copy of a religious newspaper containing a solemn editorial on the Toronto University dinner, at which, because there was wine, it was charitably assumed by the writer that there must have been intemperance. The writer deprecated the title of "Maw worm," which he seemed to think some persons might be so misguided as to apply to his moral zeal. Social crusades, such as the temperance movement, have done much good, and are most hopeful signs of moral life in a community; but they are apt to produce a one-sided morality. A man, who has been all his life committing breaches of charity and poisoning the social atmosphere around him, may fancy himself, and be fancied by others, to be a saint because he can scent debauch where there is nothing but good-fellowship. It is strange that these censors, who assume that it is impossible to touch wine without running into excess, should forget that in England, where it is the regular habit of the gentry to take a glass or two of wine every day at dinner, you may pass your life in good society without ever seeing a man the worse for liquor. Perhaps we should be better without wine: that is a question between us and our medical advisers. If you say that the use of wine, however moderate, must be morally criminal, because the beverage, if taken in excess, would intoxicate, you will have, if you are a Christian, to expurgate your Bible, striking out, among other passages, the narrative of the Marriage Feast at Cana, and to abolish the Lord's Supper. The theory that the wine of Scripture was the unfermented juice of the grape, is the most desperate of exegetical subterfuges. When people are guilty of excess and make themselves

offensive to their neighbours, they are proper subjects for interference; otherwise they are not; and the community will be none the better for a reign of malignant suspicion, which places character at the mercy of self-constituted detectives.

We have seen other criticisms on the University dinner in which there was more truth. Visitors have complained that they found in it nothing particularly characteristic of a literary body. They would not expect or desire that the speeches should be pedagogic or pedantic; but they would wish that University subjects should prevail and that the tone should be Attic, not Bœotian. The repast was laudably Attic; it was light and soon dispatched; but it must be admitted that the praise could hardly be extended to the intellectual fare. The speeches made, in response to the toast of the Honour Men of the year, were not only light, as was proper, but, so far as we caught their purport, too much resembled those which are heard at boating suppers, in a choking atmosphere of smoke. It is true, that in this case, as in those of most public dinners, a conventional programme was mainly to blame. Why all those irrelevant subjects? At a University dinner, why should we be condemned to hear people discanting on the merits of the British Monarchy, the Heir-Apparent, the Lieutenant-Governor, the Senate, the House of Commons, the Bench, the Bar, the Army and the Volunteers, while the hand of the clock is creeping towards midnight, and the audience is being spoiled for the proper toasts of the evening? Let the formal toasts be formally disposed of: let the whole of the evening be given to the appropriate toasts and the speakers to whom they belong; let the speeches seldom exceed five, or at most, ten minutes; and let us rise from table fresh and get to bed betimes, instead of going home jaded at two o'clock in the morning, and being unfitted for work next day.

—The Minister of Education for Ontario seems to be in trouble, though not, we will venture to say, from any want of desire on his part to do conscientiously all the duties of his

office. His culture and University standing rendered the choice of him for his post entirely natural and creditable to those who made it: but he was set rather late in his public life to deal with a subject which requires not only experience but almost a lifelong familiarity. Perhaps he is not, in all instances, fortunate in his subordinates, though it would be difficult for him to change without positive ground. The Department as a whole appears to be stricken with a fatal malady—want of confidence. A political Minister can hardly be expected to decide upon the comparative merits of text-books, to settle the subjects of examinations, and the method of conducting them; or, indeed, to undertake anything beyond the general administration of the office. The rest must fall into the hands of the officers, who, let their personal merits be what they will, can hardly help forming a sort of bureaucratic clique; are pretty sure, if they have a chance, to over centralize, and are apt to over-rate the importance of their department, and to overstep the limits of practicability and the measure of expense. There is evidently a growing suspicion in the Province that these tendencies prevail. We are, perhaps, partly suffering from want of circumspection in the change made six years ago. Mr. Mowat's intentions are excellent, and if he were acting in a vacuum he would always go right. But acting in a medium full of influences, he sometimes yields to them like other politicians, and it was perhaps not in his calmest or most courageous mood that he pulled down, with a somewhat unreflecting haste, the Council of Public Instruction, which he had himself reorganized only a year before. The substitution of a Minister of Education, responsible to the Legislature, for the Superintendent, was no doubt right, and the Council, unpaid, and meeting only for a few days, at considerable intervals, was obviously unfit for the purposes of current administration. But was it not a good body for the regulation of the text-books and of the subjects of instruction? As reorganized, it comprised the heads of education in the Province, with representatives of the Public Schools and High-

School teachers. Its members were thoroughly familiar with the subject, they were not connected with each other enough to form a clique, and they were pretty well above the suspicion of influence, commercial, political, or of any other kind. It was, in fact, in braving special influences, by throwing off discreditable text-books, and overhauling that superannuated nuisance, the Book Depository, that the Council met its doom. It is well that the people should feel that, at the centre of the system, and as a court of ultimate reference, there is something which commands the same sort of respect in its way which is commanded in a more important sphere by the Judiciary. If we had a Provincial University, a committee of its Senate, with representatives of the teachers, would be an obvious expedient: but a Provincial University is a vision which grows more shadowy every day.

What we have said as to the general conscientiousness of the Minister of Education may be extended, we are sure, to his action in the special case of the University appointments, which have caused so great an effusion of ink. But in this case he has not been happy in his defenders. We feel confident that a certain editorial on the "Know-nothing yell of the cultured youth of Canada," was not pleasant reading to so well-bred a gentleman as Mr. Crooks. This is the mere brutality of a bludgeon which has lost its force. The extraordinary liberality with which the Manager of the *Globe* has welcomed intellectual merit from every quarter to a partnership in the honours and emoluments of his own sphere, lends special weight to the censure visited by his highly educated pen on those whom he styles, with fine irony, "the cultured youth of Canada." Apart from "Know-nothingism," and even from the pride, not altogether criminal, which a Canadian may feel in seeing Canadians promoted to dignity, there is a plain reason of policy for making the higher appointments within the existing staff, provided any member of it is competent, because you otherwise take away the incentives to exertion. But the exception, on this occasion, was taken to an arrange-

ment which was, in itself, open to exception if ever an arrangement was; we mean the creation of a Vice-Presidency, with a distinction of salary, specially for the purpose of putting the youngest professor over the heads of the rest, and at the same time investing him with a prospective title to the Presidency which would have been extremely invidious and would have probably given birth to a great deal of jealousy and cabal. It is impossible, indeed, to believe that such a proposal could have commended itself to a man of sense, except as a mode of escape from a dilemma, which it almost certainly was. Mr. Warren's ability and scholarship are unquestionable; we have no doubt that he would be a very valuable addition in every respect to the staff of the University: but he would himself have been the greatest sufferer by the strange *tour de force* which was projected in his favour.

A special respect for classical studies, and a belief that a representative of them ought to be at the head of the University, seem to have been Mr. Crooks' leading motives, and to furnish the clue to this *imbroglio*. We heartily sympathize with his taste. But there is no use in striving to secure to the classics for ever the pre-eminence which they enjoyed when they were the only literature worth reading. They dethroned the School Philosophy, not without a desperate resistance on the part of its devotees; and the time has now come for them in turn to resign a portion of their realm. Not that they are going to drop into the graves of the School Philosophy. They remain the best educators of taste, the highest of all intellectual pleasures, the most perfect manual of humanity, while comment and illustration are daily adding to their value. But they are no longer the only literature, and Literature as a whole has now to share the domain of education with Science. To some extent the necessity of studying the originals is being superseded by good translations, though in the translations the beauty of form is lost. Perhaps Classics are more suited for a leisure class, such as the young gentlemen of England, than for the youth of a more hard-working community.

Even in England they begin to talk of ceasing to require Greek, of which few learn enough to repay their trouble, while the toilsome and barren acquisition of beggarly elements cannot fail to breed distaste for learning. Not that either Greek or Latin need be taught as both have been hitherto, but as no other language is, with a long preliminary course of weary gerund grinding. However, the Classics must be left to find their own level in the scale of studies; no propping and craning can keep them above it. The President of a University ought to be a man of pretty general culture, able to hold the balance between rival studies, and to sympathize at any rate with all his Professors. He ought to be a good specimen of the intellectual character, that the students may feel pride in him, and at the same time enough of a man of the world to deal wisely with practical questions, and represent the University worthily on all occasions. We trust there is no very grievous illiberality in adding, that familiarity with the character and ways of the youths whom he is to govern will make his task easier. Youth in all countries has its peculiarities, as a Canadian would quickly learn if he were suddenly promoted to the Headship of a College at Oxford or Cambridge, and set to govern a number of the young squires of England.

—The Quebec Scandal has passed off, we are happy to say, without leaving anything that can be called a stain on the character of the head of the Government, though he seems to have tried to make use of people with whom he had better have had nothing to do. He appears to be safe in possession of power. By way of forcing a little prosperity, the Quebecers are going to encourage, by bonuses, the production of Beet Sugar: we fear they are destined once more to prove by experience how little bonus-fed industries are worth.

In Commercial circles, at Montreal, general sympathy is expressed with Sir Francis Hincks on the total loss of his temper.

Nothing is so trying to the temper as the Currency Question, except theology and chess.

From New Brunswick comes a report of dull times, prices raised, factories closed, while their managers go to work on salaries in the United States, of a heavy fall in the value of real estate, of general discontent, which breaks out against the N. P., though it might perhaps find more reasonable objects of denunciation. A furniture firm, which finding itself unable to import in the face of 35 per cent. duty, has taken to manufacturing at home, is about the brightest spot in the picture as presented to us. Our private correspondence confirms, as far as New Brunswick is concerned, the statements which have appeared as to the growth of political disquietude. He finds a tendency towards separation from the Dominion, and even towards annexation to the United States, in quarters where it might least have been expected. The old Anti-Confederate party of 1866–'7 appears to him almost a unit in the expression of these views, while it is joined by some who were enthusiastic Unionists in the early days. A Nova Scotian writing to the *Globe* a few weeks ago said: "There are more Repealers and Anti-Confederates in Nova Scotia to-day than there were in 1867. It only wants an able, popular and eloquent leader, one in whom the people could repose confidence, to lead off in a repeal agitation, when our people would rally round him with a unanimity which would surprise the people of the West. That leader may come to the front sooner than we expect; and when the repeal agitation is inaugurated, it will not be confined to Nova Scotia, but will have for its theatre Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, and unless the politicians of the Western Provinces can succeed in buying up our leaders, as they did in 1868 and 1869, the result cannot be doubtful—the Maritime Provinces will go out of the Union." This writer mentions, among the leading causes of discontent, the Railway expenditure in the West, and the lavish pampering of British Columbia. Our own correspondent mentions, also, the extravagance of the

Administration generally, and especially the waste of money on the Department of Militia. Meanwhile, amidst the festive influences of Wimbledon, the Colonial Secretary, lapped in the blissful ignorance which is the appanage of his office, drinks to the increase of our military expenditure and of the railway undertakings of the Government. Nobody is so uncourtly as to whisper to him that the debt is straining the bonds of Confederation, and if disruption were to come the securities of our English creditors would not stand quite so high as they do now.

It is time to consider what is to be said in answer to these anti-Confederationists. How are they to be convinced that they made a mistake in 1867, and that they are making a mistake now? Confederation has produced a vast development of faction, demagogism, corruption, and extravagant expenditure. It has produced a public debt heavier, in proportion to the resources of the country, than that of the United States, though Canada has had no civil war. It has committed us to enterprises in the way of politico-military railways which are simply mad, and which, if we cannot get out of them, will be our ruin. So much is certain; and to counterbalance all this, what practical good has Confederation so far done? It was unfortunately not the deliberate work of statesmen, but the shift of politicians, who, in their faction-fight, had brought affairs to a deadlock. Had it been the deliberate work of statesmen, it would perhaps have been kept geographically within practicable limits, carried forward to completion by a legislative union, and finally crowned with self-government.

—We said that General Hancock, the Democratic nominee, was a respectable soldier. We ought to have spoken more strongly. General Hancock, as a soldier, is not only respectable, but highly distinguished, though he never held supreme command, while his general character appears to be stainless and to do honour to West Point. Still he is a mere soldier. It is true that as military Governor of Texas, at the time of the

schism between President Johnson and the Republican party, he showed a leaning towards Johnson's policy, which is now his special title to the Democratic nomination. But nobody pretends that he has studied political questions, or that he is in any sense a statesman. He would therefore be at the mercy of his Machinists. It is just to Grant to remember that, after his first election, he made an effort to emancipate himself by bringing into his government independent men, such as Stewart, of New York, and Borie, of Philadelphia; but his ignorance, both of men and questions, was fatal to his undertaking, and he soon fell helpless into the hands of his managers. The military character of the nomination, while it will flatter the army and perhaps bring over the votes of a good many soldiers, will probably repel an equal number of those who are justly jealous of approaches to military rule, and determined to keep a civilian government. Those men, who have succeeded in defeating the Third Term, will ask themselves, whether Hancock is anything but a Democratic Grant. It would not be a bad thing if the Constitution could be amended so as to preclude officers of the regular army, and judges at the same time, from being candidates for political office. The electioneering restlessness of Chief-Justice Chase, when he was at the head of the Supreme Court, gave just umbrage to those who were jealous of the honour of the judiciary; and political neutrality is hardly less essential in the case of an officer of the regular army than in that of a judge.

—The question between Hancock as a representative of the military element, and Garfield as a representative of the civilian element, to which he essentially belongs, may be said to form a special issue in this election: otherwise the contest will be simply a struggle for power and patronage between the Republican and the Democratic party. What are the Republican and the Democratic parties? is a question often asked by the enquiring stranger, and one which his American friend

sometimes has difficulty in answering, the more so as the names themselves fail to throw any light upon the matter, being, in fact, merely Latin and Greek for the same thing. The connection between Democracy and an institution so much the reverse of Democratic as slavery, is particularly hard to understand. The solution, however, is simple; and the history of American parties, apparently so complex and bewildering, may, so far as its main current is concerned, be told in very few words. At the outset there were two parties—an English and Conservative party, headed by Adams and Hamilton, which wanted a strong central government, as nearly after the English model as might be without readmitting the hereditary principle; and a Revolutionary party, closely allied in sentiment to the Revolutionary party in France, and headed by Jefferson, which wished that there should be as little of central government as possible, and that public affairs should be carried on as far as it was practicable by the immediate action of the people. The first was the party of Federation, the second was that of State Rights, a doctrine in those days really democratic. Slavery had at that time not assumed the terrible importance which it assumed after the invention of the cotton gin; it appeared as the remnant of a system of bond-service destined in the course of nature to expire. But when slavery became the great interest of the South, and was threatened by the Abolitionism of the North, it found its bulwark in the doctrine of State Rights, which forbade Federal interference with the democratic affairs and institutions of any State. Thus the Southern oligarchy became a self-styled leader of Democracy, and the Revolutionary creed of Jefferson, the philanthropist and the friend of equality, was transmuted into a doctrine of slave-owners. To make up his party, however, the slave-owner had allies at the North of two kinds: plutocrats like himself and would-be aristocrats on the one hand; on the other the Irish, a large proportion of the Germans, and other retainers, who were democratic with a vengeance, and to whom the Union was politically given up to plunder as the wages of their service in the army of slavery.

Such a coalition between the extremes of society, an oligarchy and a populace, is a political phenomenon not peculiar to the United States, nor is that the only country in which the practical bonds of alliance between the two elements have been a priesthood and the tavern. By this pseudo-democratic combination were wrought the worst of those misdeeds of which genuine democracy has borne the reproach, such as the introduction of the elective judiciary, which never was adopted by Massachusetts, and the reign of unpunished crime and public plunder in New York. Opposed to the slave-owner and his Northern confederates, as a rule, were the worth, the intelligence, the morality, the honest industry, the legality, the rational religion, the political loyalty of the Republic; not, however, without an alloy of fanaticism, which, as it manifestly tended to hurry the controversy to a violent crisis, alarmed a good many moderate men, and threw them into the Democratic party. No one needs to be told how the mine was fired at length, as any mine that there may be is sure to be fired, by a Presidential Election; how the slave-owner threw down the gauntlet; how he fell, involving the Northern wing of his party in his ruin. Such is the backbone of the history. There have been special movements, such as the Know-Nothing movement, and there have been schisms and new departures of a sectional kind under strange names, in which ambition and other personal influences have played a considerable part. The most important of the subordinate issues has been that between Free Trade and Protection. This was not unconnected with the main issue, because the Slave States, as they were incapable of manufacturing anything, were necessarily for Free Trade, while in the Free States manufactures were growing: but the lines of division were not identical, the Pennsylvanian manufacturer having been at once a Democrat and a Protectionist. The work of Mr. Spence, which had a great run in England at the outbreak of the American Civil War, and in which the main issue was represented as being not between Slavery and Free Labour, but between Free Trade and Protection, was a skilful attempt to

enlist the commercial sympathies of England on the side of the South, and to reconcile English morality to alliance with the slave-owner. It contained merely that grain of truth which is necessary to give vogue to falsehood.

To the errors and scandals of General Grant's two terms, and especially to his mal-administration of the South, the Democratic party principally owes it that it has been able to lift its head again; to re-organize its shattered forces; to recall many of those who had temporarily seceded from it, under the name of War Democrats, to its ranks; to bury its disgrace, and invest itself with a new title to allegiance, as the champion of reform against abuse, and of self-government against tyrannical centralization; to cast at least an equal vote for the Presidency at the last election; and to gain, what it now possesses, a majority in both Houses of Congress. The coming struggle will be between two great organizations, contending for power and the spoils, rather than between any two definite and paramount principles, such as Free Labour and Slavery. Slavery is dead; and though White Ascendancy survives, it has been made so complete, and the negro vote has been so entirely suppressed, under the present regime, that the South can have little left to desire in that way. State Right is a principle perfectly separate from Slavery, to the development of which, as we have said, it was antecedent; but it is not one, we apprehend, on which there is practically any very marked difference between the two parties. Railroads, canals, and commercial connections of all kinds, have so interlocked the States, that the old-fashioned theory of State Rights, founded on the idea that these communities were entirely separate, is out of date; nor do we believe that the Democracy, if the government were once in its hands, would be less jealous of its prerogative, or less inclined to extend its jurisdiction than its rival. Jackson, the typical Democrat, was certainly not disposed to increase local power at the expense of his own. With the anxious onlooker, the main question will be, what elements of the community does each party represent, and what practical influences for good or evil is it likely to

bring with it to the exercise of supreme power. On each side there is a host of mere office-seekers, machinists, and wirepullers; both hosts alike are scourges of the Commonwealth; and if the Republican party appears at present in this respect worse than its rival, it is merely because it has been for some time in place. But setting aside these professional politicians, we find that the core of the Democratic party is still the South; and apart from all questions of morality connected with Slavery or White Ascendency, it cannot be doubted that the South is inferior to the rest of the Union in civilization, so that the influence imported by it into the government would be one of comparative barbarism. Highly educated Southerners, of course, there are, but we speak of the South as a whole; and if any one thinks our judgment harsh, we refer him to "Olmsted's Cotton Kingdom," in which, we believe, he will find a faithful picture of Southern society, as it was just before the war, and as, in all essential respects, it is still. After the South come the Irish whose lack of constitutional training is their misfortune, not their fault, but is not the less fatal to their power of acting as good and intelligent citizens of a Republic, while their religion makes them the tools of the priesthood, which, whatever may be its ecclesiastical virtues, is antagonistic, politically and socially, to the organic principles of modern civilization. To suppose that the Irish, in attaching themselves to the Democratic party, are actuated by a love of self-government, or administrative reform, would be preposterous; their tendencies are adverse to both: they are addicted to the blind following of chiefs, and to claiming, with jealous importunity, their national share of the spoils. In adhering to the Democracy, they follow at best a name and a sort of clan tradition, wholly unconnected with principle. To the Irish may still be added a large section of the Germans, and the Germans of the beer-gardens rather than those of the Prussian public school, who are also caught, probably, by the name. The liquor interest is naturally, as a rule, on the same side, and it is no inconsiderable power. Among the wealthy leaders of the Democratic party, it may

be surmised that there are not a few who, in their hearts, are but little attached to Republican institutions; who regarded Slavery with positive favour, as an aristocratic system; who use the passions of the populace to combat a Government of the people; and whose antagonism is the surest indication that the genuine spirit of Republicanism is on the side to which they are opposed. Of the presence of very good and patriotic men in the Democratic ranks, the name of Senator Bayard is a sufficient proof; and to such men, no doubt, the party presents itself as the means of guarding the Constitution, and repelling centralizing aggression. But when we look at the party as a whole, it is impossible not to feel the strongest misgivings as to the results of its return to power; nor are these misgivings in any way diminished by its conduct in Congress during the session which has just closed.

—In the Democratic platform there is a plank in favour of honest money, not excluding, however, that particular form of financial folly and roguery which consists in debasing the currency and defrauding public and private creditors, by the enactment of laws ordaining that silver (and perhaps some day brass or nickel) shall pass for gold. But there is a suspicious affinity between the Democrats and the Greenbackers, who together made an attempt on the constitutional life of the State, under the name of Fusionists, in Maine. This may be merely the natural attraction of opposition for all malcontents which makes the party out of power a cave of Adullam: we fear, however, that it is something more.

It does not seem probable that the appeal against the "Fraud" will be very effective, though the Democrats of course lift their hands to avenging Heaven. The issue is somewhat stale, and Mr. Hayes is not a candidate. Moreover, it was always pretty hollow: that there was Republican fraud, and of a most infamous kind, in Louisiana, cannot be doubted: but it is equally unquestionable that there was throughout the South,

and is going to be again, a lawless suppression, by Democratic fraud or violence, of the negro vote. That the negro is unfit to be trusted with a vote is very likely; so is a white, whose political character has been formed by slave-driving; but both have the vote by law, and the objection to cheating or intimidation is in both cases the same. Maine, too, is a full set-off against Louisiana. Unhappily, though the memory of "the greatest Crime of the century" is not likely to tell much on the election, it is too likely to tell in the counting. Should the result be again open to question (a contingency far from improbable), and should the decision fall to a Congress in which the Democrats have a majority, the temptation to redress an alleged wrong by committing another wrong would be great, and there is nothing to assure us that it would be resisted. By the hasty re-incorporation of the South, a fatal spirit of lawlessness has been imported into the Union; and the Republic, even if it escapes the present danger, will have for some time to come reason to rue the unreflecting good nature which admitted a plague-stricken ship without salutary quarantine. The renunciation of vengeance was admirable, and put the traducers of democracy to shame: but in the interest of the South, as well as that of the North, statesmanship ought to have secured to American civilization the objects for which enormous sacrifices had been made.

—It is difficult to see from a distance what is really going on in England. An hour on the spot would tell us more than all the cablegrams and correspondence, which, we must once more remind our readers, come from London, where the feeling, both political and social, is intensely hostile to Mr. Gladstone. Newspaper correspondents tell us that the Premier is growing testy; if badgering can make a man testy he may well be so; but the accounts which we receive from private correspondents are favourable to the tact and judgment of his leadership though the writers are far from being his devoted adherents

or indisposed to criticize his strategy. Assuredly, whatever powers of leadership he has, he needs them now. The Opposition, breathing the atmosphere of London drawing-rooms in which "the people's William" is hated far more bitterly than a more orthodox object of hatred; encouraged by the recovery of one or two seats which were lost in the rush of the popular uprising against the late Government; touched as a body of landowners in the most vital and sensitive point by the Compensation Bill, the Opposition is manifestly furious. Its nominal leader, a man of moderate temper, is evidently swept along at the head of an assaulting column which he cannot control. The Tories are practically combining with the Fenians for the obstruction of legislation. In truth, the state of the House of Commons is apparently becoming serious. Parliamentary Government can go on only if the minority, after fully stating its case, will yield to the majority, and all parties will concur in expediting the business. It is not unlikely that the British Parliament in the coming years may display, in a very significant manner, the weak points of these institutions. The scenes in the House of Commons are most violent, and mark the ominous transition from questions which are merely political, to those which affect property and class. As we write, appearances betoken a collision between the Lords and the Commons with which another "irrepressible conflict" may commence.

We have said before that a separation of the Whigs from the Liberals must come, and would probably come as soon as any serious question should arise about the land. The Whigs are a section of the land-owning aristocracy. We have traced their pedigree before. They represent the new nobility, formed under the Tudors out of the grantees of monastery lands, who, by the origin of their property were bound to Protestantism and to the politics with which it was connected. Having led the nation to victory over the Papists and Absolutists in 1688, they afterwards formed a powerful oligarchy, which held in tutelage the Kings of the House of Brunswick, whom they had set, and whom they kept, upon the throne. By George III., whom

the extinction of the Stuarts had secured against rivals, the oligarchy of Whig houses was overturned and plunged into opposition, from which it emerged, at the head of the Reform movement, after the close of the French War. But since that time it has been gradually yielding to the bias of its class affinities. The heads of the great houses are nailed to their place by leadership and history, though the head of the great house of Seymour has virtually seceded. But the Whigs of the lesser houses are fast going over to their own place. Their own place the Conservative camp is, if they obey the most natural impulses of rank and interest. A member of an aristocracy who should see into the situation, understand that the only use of his hereditary rank in the present day was to make the past slide gently into the future, and act on that principle by steadfastly casting in his lot with Progress, would show himself to be not only a man of remarkable perspicacity but moulded of the very finest clay of humanity.

—Desperate difficulties surround the Irish Question, especially when it has to be dealt with in the midst of a raging faction fight. For our own part we are not agrarians. We cannot see why a man's land should be more liable to confiscation by the State than his ship or his goods. If it is said that land is the gift of nature, we answer that raw land is the gift of nature, but that tilled land is the work of industry. In every work of industry there must be raw material and natural forces: there are in a ship, in a piece of cloth, in your hat, which a sovereign assembly may legislate off your head if it thinks fit. Everything must be liable to confiscation or nothing; and if everything were liable to confiscation nothing would be produced; land would not be tilled, nor would ships, cloth, or hats be made. Indeed, what the Irish want is not common ownership, such as the Communists desire, or anything of the kind. What each of them wants is to have the land which he occupies as his own, without payment of rent. That everybody has

a natural right to live on the land is another aphorism which is continually repeated as though it were self-evident; but if an Irishman has a two-acre lot and twelve children, where is the use of saying that all his children have a right to live on the land? They cannot all live on their father's lot, and if they are to have other lots assigned them, somebody must be ousted to make room for them. The law owes, it seems to us, as a rule, the same protection to landed property as to any other kind of property, and on the same grounds both of justice and of expediency. But Ireland is practically an exceptional case. The ownership of land in that country is itself the heritage of confiscation, and of confiscation which has never been forgotten. This struggle is, in fact, the last stage of a long civil war, waged between the conquered race and an intrusive proprietary which was closely identified with the political ascendency of the foreigner and the religious ascendency of an alien creed. If the war has been waged on the part of the natives more by conspiracy than by open fighting, it has not been the less murderous, nor has the enmity which it has created between classes been the less deadly. Respect for the property of the landowner has, in truth, never had a chance of taking root in the Irish mind. Absenteeism, the almost inevitable consequence of the repulsiveness and danger of residence in Ireland, has increased estrangement. The peasantry has multiplied for centuries in misery without its natural civilizers and guides. Now, as in 1846, comes famine and adds to agrarianism despair. It is impossible to evict a nation. The Government must arbitrate between the parties as best it can, and require of the landlord such temporary concessions as are necessary to prevent the total overthrow of his rights. With this object, it cannot be doubted, the Compensation Bill has been framed, and its framer, Mr. Foster, is about the most Conservative member of the Cabinet. Mr. Parnell, in his violent and ill-conditioned way, assails everything reasonable and especially that which is most in his own favour. If he could succeed in overturning the Government, the Tories would ride back into power with renewed

force, and with a few regiments would soon settle the Irish agitation. No Englishman can see without anguish the unfailing flow of this fountain of calamity, the bitter waters of which are now streaming, in the form of a vast Irish immigration, over England as well as over Ireland itself. The apostles of Force, such as Mr. Froude, think it a perfectly sufficient reason for conquering and enslaving the Irish that they were weak: weak in arms they may be, but they have proved strong enough in their misery and its hideous consequences to shake the pillars of the Empire; and the end of these disasters is not yet.

—Out of the Bradlaugh affair, at all events, Mr. Gladstone appears to have come well, while his enemies, as the reward of their hypocritical attempt to connect him with hostility to religion, have covered themselves with ridicule. Who would have thought it possible that 280 men of the world could have made such old women of themselves as to shut a man up in the Clock Tower for not believing in the Deity? The people were not taken in: to the confusion of the legislators, they saw plainly enough that the religious question had nothing to do with the question of political right. Mr. Plimsoll spoke for the masses when he wrote to Mr. Bradlaugh that, as a firm believer in Christianity, he was on the side of justice. Bradlaugh, of course, has gained immensely in influence: he showed that he that he was no Kenealy by making a powerful and impressive speech in perfectly good taste. Among the foremost of his assailants, it seems, was a Jew, himself just emancipated from religious disabilities, who no doubt regards the Supreme Being as a very useful guardian of shekels. The matter has now sunk into the hands of informers who are now suing Bradlaugh for legal penalties. England and Christianity will be dishonoured if the rogues recover a cent.

—The Game Laws will not go this Session; but they will go. That they should have lived so long proves the strength of the

land-owning element in the Liberal party, for they have always been manifestly condemned by Liberal principles and by the public good. There are some on the democratic side of the Atlantic whom it is necessary to remind that the English game laws are not like our laws for the conservation of game, but laws practically confining the liberty of killing game to a privileged class. Poaching is in England no small item in the rural calendar of crime, and not unfrequently it is the first step in the downward course of the peasant: he begins by breaking an arbitrary law, gets a bad name, becomes a social outcast, and in the end a felon. Justice, under the present system of county government, is administered by a Bench of Game Preservers. The existence of these laws is in itself enough to show the element of feudal character which English society has retained, though no Conqueror now lays waste a wide district, destroying the church as well as the hamlet and the grange, to make a New Forest. To the Norman king or lord, full of fierce animal vigour, and living during the intervals of war in a lonely castle, without anything to occupy his coarse, illiterate mind, the chase was at once a physical and mental necessity. Hence the extraordinary tenacity with which the whole race battled for its forest privileges, and the almost insane cruelty with which it enforced forest law. Perhaps we may go back even further, and trace in the tastes of Squire Western a lingering relic of the hunter state of man. The modern English landowner is scarcely less full of animal vigour than the Norman, and not very much better provided with indoor recreations. He therefore clings with a tight grasp to his game and the laws which protect it; in a sequestered and squire-ridden parish, the reign of awe over man and dog which prevails, while the pheasants and partridges are sitting, would not have seemed discreditable to the Conqueror. Shooting, however, as well as fox-hunting, has become extremely artificial, and has almost lost the character of wild sport. A battue is dull and senseless carnage, which might as well be enacted in a barn-yard as in a wood. Pheasants are actually bred, like domestic fowls, in

hutches. There could be no sharper satire on the system than the fact that the Maharajah Dhuleep Singh, an Oriental domiciled in England, eclipsed all the English game preservers in the enormity of his "bag" of game. Economy will now combine with Liberalism to put an end to game-preserving on English farms, which can no longer hold their own against hares in the wheat, added to American competition. These changes, however, tend to break up English country life, and the political regime of which that life is the basis. Without the fox-hunt and the battue, the modern manor-house is almost as dull an abode for an inmate who reads nothing but the newspaper as a Norman castle. The landowner will live less in his country place, more in the pleasure cities; his social, and with it his political, influence will decline. It will be so at least unless he turns farmer in good earnest, as he may possibly be obliged to do by the diminution of his rents, which in that case would be a blessing in disguise.

—When it was first proposed to hand over the Election Petitions from the House of Commons to the Judges, Chief Justice Cockburn strongly protested on the ground that the ermine would be in danger of being stained by political trials. His prophecy of evil seemed to have been totally falsified by the event: but the account of the Election Trial at Plymouth shows that his fears were not wholly groundless. Mr. Justice Lush, it seems, found himself compelled to unseat Sir Edward Bates for bribery through his agent, but in doing so his Lordship, who has evidently great respect and sympathy for the political character of Sir Edward, thought fit to remark: "The petitioners, actuated, as I think and believe, by party spirit, have succeeded in depriving not only the poor and needy of all creeds and denominations, religious and political, in Plymouth, but also the people at large, of a kind friend and generous benefactor, and the majority of the constituency of a member of whom they had good reason to be proud." It was evidently a case of

"nursing a borough." Nursing a borough is a refined practice which, since the passing of the new Bribery Act, has taken the place of the old-fashioned system of coarse bribery. You buy the constituency, not by bribes at the election time, but by giving doles to the poorer electors every year and all the year round. You ask no questions about the vote which any one has given or intends to give; if you did you would come within the grasp of the law; but you let it be understood that the doles will be forthcoming so long as you are the member and no longer. We say that Plymouth was evidently a case of this kind, not only because it is generally stated to have been so, but because Mr. Justice Lush himself distinctly implies that Sir Edward Bates will discontinue his doles when he ceases to be the member for Plymouth. No doubt this systematic corruption formed the real ground of the petition, though the technical ground was the act of bribery by an agent at the time of the election. The Judge denounces the petitioners for being actuated by party spirit, as though election petitions generally emanated from a speculative love of public purity and virtue. No Canadian judge, we are happy to say, has ever so far exceeded his functions as this representative of the renowned judiciary of England. But the case may serve as a warning of the special delicacy of the duties which a judge trying an election petition is called on to perform, and of the absolute necessity of his confining himself to the law and the facts, and resisting any temptation, however strong, to launch into gratuitous comments. Let one or two of our judges give vent to their feelings as Mr. Justice Lush appears to have done and the authority of the judges in election trials will be gravely shaken; nor will the bad effects end there.

—Acute observers of commercial opinion in England say that there will be a return to Protection, and that the movement will commence in the very quarter which gave birth to Free Trade. There is a good deal to produce this impression;

we know that even in those sanctuaries of Free Trade sentiment, the Northern Chambers of Commerce, the cry for Reciprocity has been heard; and we can well believe that if interest appeared to demand a change of policy, cosmopolitan philanthropy would soon go to the wall. Nevertheless, we do not think that England will return to Protection. The farmer will not allow the manufacturer to raise, by protective duties, the price of clothes and tools; still less will the manufacturer allow the farmer to raise the price of food. Reciprocity treaties, which the pure Free Trader repudiates as a form of Protection, may come into favour as the means of opening foreign ports to English goods, though their fatal instability and the consequent uncertainty of the trade based upon them has been too clearly proved: more we do not anticipate.

Certain it is, however, that a change has been coming over the political economy of Europe in connection with the growth of continental manufactures and with the fiscal necessities simultaneously imposed by the military system. Recent writers, instead of being cosmopolitan, are national. By the cosmopolitan and philanthropic Free Trader it is assumed that mankind is one community, and that the same rule which holds good between the different members of the same nation must hold good between the different members of humanity. But this at present is not the fact; at present mankind is divided into nations, with distinct interests and national tariffs which they cannot be prevented from regulating each in the way that suits it best. England is a nation subsisting by the exportation of manufactures, and she will naturally regulate her policy accordingly, and be inclined to see everything from that point of view. But, as we have said before, she is not really a Free Trade nation: she raises a large portion of her revenue by import duties, though she takes care not to tax the raw materials of her industries, while her power of cheap production has till recently been an effectual protection against the importation of rival goods. Examine her system, and you find it national, not cosmopolitan, though the members of humanity to whose goods

she refuses free admission are the producers of tea, coffee, wine, spirits and tobacco. German writers have broached the idea that a special system of economy, as well as a special set of political institutions, is a necessary adjunct of the peculiar character of each nation: this seems to us fantastic; but we believe that there will be national tariffs so long as there is need of import duties on a large scale; and there will be need of import duties on a large scale so long at least as there are international rivalries and wars. If righteousness and peace could reign, the tariff question would hardly trouble us any more. Free Trade enthusiasts tell us that commerce is the great missionary of righteousness and peace; but to this history, unhappily, can only give a very qualified assent. It was commerce that made the Opium Wars and the Treaty of Tien-tsin.

Again, political economy shows a tendency to return to the path traced for it by its illustrious founder, Adam Smith, which, in our humble opinion, it ought never to have left. Adam Smith treated the subject historically, and by way of observation, garnering the fruits of experience as he went along, but not turning rules of general expediency into adamantine laws. He admits, for example, exceptions to the principle of Free Trade, suggested by the same experience on which the principle rests. The very title of his book, "The Wealth of Nations," indicates his point of view. But after him came writers who turned political economy into a deductive science, establishing, as they thought, universal principles, and deriving all the rules of action from them. Some of these, as though the subject had attained mathematical precision, even went the length of clothing economic laws in algebraic formulæ. Nominally, they admitted that, in order to constitute their science, they had been obliged to eliminate all human motives, except the desire of wealth, and that this elimination must be hypothetical only: practically, they treated it as not merely hypothetical but actual, requiring us to be ruled by the desire of wealth, and by that alone. But political, social, military motives, as well as economical, must sometimes prevail. It is folly, no doubt, in the vast majority of

cases to reject the advantages of Free Trade and open competition; and so it is folly in the vast majority of cases to ravage your own country or to burn down your own capital; yet you may wisely do either of these things for the purpose of dislodging an invader; and it may be equally consistent with wisdom to put up with some loss or inconvenience in the way of trade for the sake of national objects of a higher kind. Clearly, also, it may be the plainest dictate of prudence sometimes to sacrifice present interest to the larger interests of the future; and if a new country is really the gainer in the end by protecting its infant manufactures, no science of wealth can possibly lay its ban upon that policy. That there are principles, and very valuable principles, in Political Economy, is certain; but, as we believe, they never can be applied without considering the circumstances of the particular case. If Sir Richard Cartwright had known this, he might still be Minister of Finance.

Another consequence of the ultra-scientific view of Political Economy, as we venture to think, is a tendency to barren metaphysics. This is seen in the disquisitions on the nature of rent, which are really not more fruitful than the verbal definitions of the schoolmen. Rent is the hire paid for land, houses, and real estate generally; that we do not use the word hire in this sense as in the case of a carriage or any other chattel, is a mere accident of language, and denotes no essential difference. In other languages, the same word is used for all the cases alike. A great practical truth was supposed to be discovered, or re-discovered, by Ricardo, when he announced that rent was the excess of the produce of land beyond what would be returned to the same capital if employed on the worst land in cultivation. But rent often bears no relation to the fertility of the soil: you may pay a high rent for proximity to a city, for the privilege of working minerals, or for a fine view. A farmer will not take a farm unless he can make something by it above the rent; no more will a hackman hire a carriage and horses from the stable-keeper unless by his fares he can make some-

thing above the hire: we believe there is no more in the renowned law, and no metaphysician is needed to tell us this.

—If the inconsistency and unpopularity of keeping Sir Bartle Frere in command were encountered for the sake of South African Confederation, the investment was not a good one: for South African Confederation is dead. The Cape Legislature refuses, apparently, even to take it into consideration. Perhaps the members have an inkling of the fact that Canadian Confederation, which has been held up to them as an example by Downing Street, is not, financially at least, an assured success: at all events they must know that the cases are not parallel, the Provinces of South Africa in which the native or the Dutch element prevails, and which form the chief difficulty there, having no counterpart here. Yet, to prepare the ground for this magnificent structure, blood has been lavishly shed, money squandered by millions, the rights of humanity have been trampled under foot, disgrace has been brought upon the nation, and the seeds of future troubles have been widely sown. Lord Carnarvon, the Colonial Secretary, who conceived the scheme, and is responsible for all that has been done, is one of the best of men: in point of benevolence he was perfectly well qualified to be a Providence to all the Colonies: he lacked nothing but omnipresence and omniscience.

—The Eastern Question marches once more rapidly to a crisis, and we see that English Liberals, if they looked at the matter from a merely party point of view, might not have been anxious for the immediate accession of their friends to power. The Tory policy was based on the stability of the Turkish empire: the Turkish empire was nodding to its fall; and it might perhaps have been better for the Liberals that it should fall while the Tories were in power. Mr. Gladstone, however, appears prepared to deal vigorously with the matter, and people who fancy that Liberalism is Quakerism will be sur-

prised on learning that the word has been passed to have the forces of England in readiness. To all demands for the fulfilment of reform pledges Turkey responds with the sad *non possumus* of the dying. But, whatever coarse and fanatical virtues may be possessed by the Provincial Turk, the Turk of Constantantinople is a corrupt and plundering debauchee, who only wants to empty the till to the last sequin before the end comes. That he is secretly holding out his hands to Russia to save him from reform is perfectly credible; he has no patriotism or sense of honour to prevent him. The suspicion generally felt of his manœuvres in that direction, is enough to show how trustworthy a guardian he is of the interests of Europe against Russian ambition. The time for packing his "bag and baggage" is come, and he will have to go farther than to Brusa. No real line severs Asia from Europe. The Ægean Sea, with its coasts and islands, is the Greece of the past, and is likely to be the Greece of the future. Over that area, the race which speaks the Hellenic tongue has continued, though dethroned, depressed and broken, to be the staple of the population. But it can hardly be doubted that the Ottoman Empire as a whole will cease to exist, and leave a vacuum into which, or some parts of which, it is not unlikely that emigration from the West may flow. Attention is already being turned to the natural resources of Asiatic Turkey. In the earliest times, the most genial and fruitful regions of the earth became the seats of the great empires; the weaker or less-favoured tribes were driven away to the inclement North; but there they renewed their vigour, underwent a severe process of natural selection, and became the conquering nations of later times. In the meantime, the decay of the East has left in the Valley of the Euphrates and elsewhere voids into which the tide of population may now flow again. Wholly apart from those questions of the balance of power with which diplomacy concerns itself, the opening of the vast territories which Turkish despotism has long closed against industry and civilization will be an event of the highest importance to humanity.

—When the Jesuits were expelled, a crowd of sympathizers gathered round them. But of whom did the crowd consist? Of the poor to whom the Fathers had preached the Gospel? No, it consisted of the wealthy and aristocratic enemies of the Republic. It was a mob of the Faubourg St. Germain, which after all, in passion and selfishness, is much the same as a mob of the Faubourg St. Antoine. Jesuitism is the bond and the propaganda of the party of social and political reaction. It is a great conspiracy, under a foreign head, against the liberties, civil and intellectual, of every nation in which it plants itself, even though it may sometimes choose, among other disguises, to put on the cap of liberty. It preaches, confesses, and educates, but all for an ulterior purpose, the reëstablishment of political and spiritual despotism on the ruins of free institutions and of the Reformation. In France, Jesuitism seeks the life of the Republic. In expelling it, the Republic may be acting wisely or unwisely, rightly or wrongly; but it is not committing a mere act of religious persecution. Our forefathers were not committing a mere act of religious persecution when they expelled the Jesuits who had been the instigators and councillors of James II. But the Jesuits themselves have practised religious persecution in the most cruel way, whenever they could get the powers of the world to lend them the use of the temporal sword. The land from which they are now being driven was that in which they persuaded Louis XIV., through a bigoted woman, to recall the Edict of Nantes, in which they perpetrated, by the hand of the tyrant, the Dragonnades and the butchery of the Protestants in the Cevennes. To-morrow, if they could gain the power, they would quench religious liberty in blood. Supported, as they are, by a powerful party, the expulsion of them is a perilous measure; it is one to which, let it be remembered, the Government was driven by the resistance of the Conservatives in the Senate to the Ferry Education law; but the amount of popular sympathy with the exiles seems to be very small; while the party of aristocratic and plutocratic reaction will be weakened by their departure, and it cannot be made more hostile to the Republic than it is.

It is evident that the National Festival, in commemoration of the taking of the Bastille, was heartily celebrated by the people throughout France; though in the midst of the general rejoicing and illumination, the Faubourg St. Germain remained sad and dark. No event in history more distinctly marks an era than the fate of the most renowned fortress and dungeon of Feudal Monarchy. Widely different has been the course of things from that to which the captors of the Bastille, in their newborn enthusiasm, looked forward: far distant yet is the millenium of social perfection and brotherhood of the immediate advent of which they dreamed. Since their day, and in no small measure, through the wreck of their visions, mankind has learned to mistrust the Ideal. Yet those who would restore the Bastille are few, and almost confined to that unilluminated Faubourg St. Germain. Pessimism reminds us that there was joyous dancing on the site of the Bastille when it fell, that there was in those same days the Feast of Federation in the Champ de Mars, with almost delirious outpourings of joy; and that all this proved but the gay rainbow that overarches the waters just as they are about to plunge into the abyss. But the omen is false. There is little more in the analogy than would hold good with regard to any picture of mortal hopes. In 1790, France was absolutely untrained in self-government; she had no statesmen, but only a chaotic assembly of chimeras, resentments, and ambitions; her people were destitute of political information, even as to passing events; not one in twenty of them could read; there was no newspaper press; famine and misery stalked through the land; public bankruptcy was at the door; monarchical Europe was looking on with jealous eyes and preparing to take arms against the Revolution. All this is changed now, and France has had a century of terrible but fruitful experience. The Revolution is, economically, a wonderful success: it has even carried the lavish expenditure, the enormous corruptions, and the disastrous wars of the Second Empire. If the people are not enthusiastic about the Republic; if they do not expect of it immediate and universal felicity; it is evident

that they accept it with a reasonable loyalty which, as matters stand, seems likely to be lasting.

Not that danger is by any means at an end. Rochefort, the shallow and hot-headed, renews his appeal to anarchy, and not without success, if the circulation of his journal is a test. On the other hand, reaction is still strong, and it has in France as elsewhere, the compactness of a party of class interest, while its antagonist betrays the looseness and the internal divergences of a party of opinion. France has no longer an aristocracy of political privilege; she has no longer a legal aristocracy at all; but she has an aristocracy of hereditary title and social grade which leads, animates, consolidates, and, to servile minds, dignifies resistance to the Republic. The wealth of the aristocratic houses, lost in the first Revolution, has now been to a great extent restored, and is increased by marriages with the heiresses of rich plebeians desirous of a patrician connection. Shrewd observers of French society have depicted the powerful though contemptible influence of titular nobility, and the manner in which flunkeyism pays tribute to it, and woos its patronage, by the adoption or affectation of reactionary sentiment. With aristocracy, as with Jesuitism, a mortal conflict will some day come.

—In Germany they seem at present to be less occupied with anything political or diplomatic than with the dangers which they imagine threaten their own land from the progress of the Jews. There is hardly in history a more curious instance of the unexpected than the turn which this question has suddenly taken and the dimensions which it has assumed. It is not one of religion: all the declamations against bigotry are out of place: at Berlin no umbrage would be taken at your worshipping Ashtaroth or your meerschaum. History in fact shows, that, of all European nations the Germans have been the most free from the vice of persecution. This is a struggle of the natives against the progress of an intrusive race, which, is believed by its patient

Oriental craft, to be getting into its hands not only the money of the nation but the newspaper press and other organs of influence, while it is said to avoid manual labour, seldom to produce or even to organize production, to decline as much as possible public burdens, to retain its exclusive nationality, and to be little more attached to the particular country in which it happens to sojourn than is the caterpillar to the particular leaf on which it feeds. That the Jew retains an exclusive nationality (it should rather be called tribalism) the hierophants of the Jewish mystery themselves admit. Germany has had Jews, by race at least, with whom she has got on very well and of whom she is proud, who gave her Neander and Mendelssohn. But it seems that there has of late been a great irruption from Poland of Jews of a peculiarly hard-shell kind. The Germans are in great alarm: they fancy that by the steady and united persistence of the Hebrews they will be reduced to the condition of Gibeonites in their own Fatherland, and they even invoke the assistance of the Sclav to save them from the Jew. We may feel pretty sure that their fears are exaggerated, and that German intellect will in the end hold its own, even on the Bourse. Still their feeling is not unintelligible, nor a proof of disgraceful narrowness of mind. A high degree of liberality and self abnegation must be reached before a nation can see with pleasure an alien race climbing, by superior subtlety and acquisitiveness, over its head in the land which the sweat of its own brow has made fruitful and for which it has poured out its own blood. Moreover the German may say that if he is to have masters, he wishes at all events that their morality should be high, and that whether it has been the fault of the Jews themselves, or that of the nations on which they thrust themselves, they have for twenty centuries undergone, in the practice of clandestine usury and cognate pursuits, a training which, however favourable to sharpness of wit could hardly be favourable to high morality. The purely financial instinct is not that which is most easily transmuted into a noble leadership of humanity. No religious tolerance can enjoin us to

disguise the fact that the Oriental character, in its leading features, is inferior to the European, and that the ascendancy of an Oriental over a European race, whether effected by money power or any other power, would consequently be a great calamity. A community so thoroughly sound as Scotland seems to repel Jewish settlement, while Jews swarm in diseased communities such as Poland. If a local nationality, with its ties, influences and aspirations is good for other people, the want of it must be bad for the Jews. Mr. Lawrence Oliphant is reported to be negotiating with the Porte for the cession of Palestine to its former possessors; let him and those whom he represents put money in their purse, and they will scarcely fail while their success is much to be desired.

—Dr. Ryerson has brought out two volumes entitled "The Loyalists of America and their Times," in the preface of which he says "As no Indian pen has ever traced the history of the aborigines of America, or recorded the deeds of their chieftains, their 'prowess and their wrongs'—their enemies and spoilers being their historians; so the history of the Loyalists of America has never been written except by their enemies and spoilers, and those English historians who have not troubled themselves with examining original authorities, but have adopted the authorities, and in some instances imbibed the spirit, of American historians, who have never tired in (*sic*) eulogizing Americans and everything American, and deprecating (*sic*) everything English, and all who have loyally adhered to the unity of the British Empire." This opening sentence indicates the writer's point of view as well as his style. The well-known work of Mr. Lorenzo Sabine on the "Loyalists of the American Revolution," is not only a monument of exhaustive industry, but written in the most friendly spirit possible. Its whole tenor confirms its author's assertion that he and his publishers "found their principal reward in the belief that they had done something for the cause of human brotherhood, by lessening the ran-

cour—even the hate—which long existed between the children of the winners and the children of the expatriated losers, in the civil war which dismembered the British Empire." Not long since the New York Historical Society brought out, in two portly volumes, with copious notes and illustrations, the contemporary history of New York during the Revolution, by the Royalist Judge Thomas Jones, which had remained in manuscript up to that time. This book does not seem to have fallen under Dr. Ryerson's notice, though it is the most important source of information on the special subject of his own work. Jones was a thorough-going Royalist, and he abuses the leaders of the Revolution as handsomely as anyone can desire; but he was clearsighted and critical; from him we learn plainly enough why the Royal armies failed. The spirit of the notes and illustrations is not less friendly and liberal towards the Loyalists than is that of the work of Mr. Sabine.

Are we to be dragged again through the history of this old quarrel, with all its heeltaps and afterclaps? Are these smouldering ashes of hatred to be raked anew? A century has passed since the Revolutionary war; half a century since the last of those who could have taken any active part in it went down to their graves; twenty years since, in token of final reconciliation between the two countries principally concerned, the heir of George III. became the guest of the American Republic. The question between the adherents of the Crown and those of the Revolution has been discussed to the dregs, and little difference of opinion, we should think, can remain among well-informed and right-minded men. Few, we imagine, would contend that the Stamp Act and the Tea Duty were in themselves sufficient reasons for taking arms against a Government in other respects good, or for severing a connection in other respects beneficial. The Stamp Act had been repealed, though with a foolish and sinister saving of the right to do what it was admitted at the same time could not rightfully be done, which showed that the practical statesmen could be as completely fooled by abstractions as any closeteer. It was at least possible that the repeal

of the Tea Duty might also be obtained by peaceful means; and no candid man can maintain that the imposition of the tax, however reprehensible, was clearly beyond the legal competence of Parliament, though Chatham chose to draw a super-subtle distinction between the power of regulating trade and that of regulating the fiscal system. But behind the Stamp Act and the Tea Duty lay that general system of commercial restriction which tyrannically repressed colonial industry in the supposed interest of the Mother Country, and under which the Colonies could no longer live. Behind that again lay the danger, which had been growing since the revival of Toryism and Prerogative under George III., of the destruction, by the intrusion of Vice-royalty, aristocracy, and an Anglican Establishment, of the practical self-government which the Colonies had enjoyed, and of the religious system to which they were dedicated. The Puritan Colonies had been sent out by that Republican England, which, its aspirations being then premature for the nation as a whole, had succumbed to the Royalist England at the Reformation; and a conflict was the certain result of an attempt made by the representatives of the Stuarts and Laud to reduce under their dominion, and recast in their political and ecclesiastical mould, settlements in which the ruling spirits were the representatives of Pym, Hampden, Vane, and Cromwell. In any case, the political severance of the New World from the Old was an event sure to come. It was necessary not only to the free growth of American civilization, but to the progress of humanity. A few clear-sighted men saw this at the time: all but idiots and courtiers see it now. Perhaps more persons saw it at the time, in the Colonies at least, than ventured to avow their conviction. If this was the case, it is a strong warning against resigning ourselves to the tyranny of conventional opinion. Free discussion, had it been possible, might have opened the eyes of statesmen to the real nature of the situation, calmed the temper of men, as well as given a better direction to their thoughts, and thus have averted one of the great calamities of history. For on that black list we must

place a war which inflicted heavy loss and deep disgrace on England; which, by completing the financial ruin of France, brought on that most terrible and destructive of all social cataclysms, the French Revolution; which fatally baptized the American Republic in demagogism and political violence; which set one part of the English race on this continent against the other, and has to this hour dedicated Canada to the perpetuation of an ancient feud, in which the substantial interests of her own people have been too much forgotten.

Civil wars are always cruel, because in them political and personal are added to military passions. The American Civil War was no exception to this rule; and while the atrocities committed on both sides were many, not the fewest nor the least, assuredly, were committed by the king's party. The leaders of that party were for the most part persons of the higher class; officials, territorial magnates of the Colonies in which the feudal system of land-owning prevailed, commercial men interested in the system, clergymen of the Established Church; but, as commonly happens, the two extremes of society were united, and the Royal cause was disgraced by the acts not only of wild Highlanders drawn into the field by personal influence, but of mere plunderers and cut-throats. Nobody, we presume, wishes now to trace his pedigree to the perpetrators of the Wyoming massacre, or to Bloody Bill Cunningham and his gang, any more than to the worst of the Green Mountain Boys. These outrages, as well as those perpetrated by the Indians, wickedly and insanely taken into the King's pay, and the brutal excesses of the Hessians, as the war went on, threw a large number of waverers, and of even those who at the outset were Royalists, into the arms of the Revolutionary party. We learn from Judge Jones what was the effect produced by the march of the Royal army through New Jersey. These outrages excused but could not justify, much less reconcile with a sound policy, the banishment of the vanquished Loyalists and the confiscation of their estates at the close of the war; measures against which the best of the Revolutionary states-

men, and notably Hamilton, entered a protest at the time, and which, we believe, all reasonable Americans now condemn. A magnanimous amnesty would soon have brought reconciliation and oblivion: vengeance led to the foundation on the borders of the United States of a hostile settlement which thirty years afterwards renewed the conflict in the field under the banner of the British monarchy, and has been a thorn in the side of the Republic ever since.

Those who wish to clear their perceptions and calm their feelings upon this subject will do well to study the cases of the waverers or the reluctant combatants whose pangs and oscillations show that, in the opinion of good and sensible men, there was some right, or at all events some wrong, on both sides. The English Civil War divided from each other two friends, Sir Ralph Hopton and Sir William Waller. Sir William Waller, wrote to Sir Ralph Hopton: "My affections to you are so unchangeable that hostility itself cannot violate my friendship to your person; but I must be true to the cause wherein I serve. The great God who is the searcher of my heart knows with what reluctance I go upon this service, and with what perfect hatred I look upon a war without an enemy. The God of peace in his good time send us peace, and in the meantime fit us to receive it. We are both on the stage, and we must act the parts that are assigned us in this tragedy. Let us do it in a way of honour and without personal animosities." Mr. Sabine says of Mr. Beverley Robinson, the head of a great U. E. Loyalist family, "When the Revolutionary controversy commenced, he was living upon that portion of Phillips' estate which had been given to his wife, and there he desired to remain, in the quiet enjoyment of country life and in the management of his large domain. That such was his inclination was asserted by the late President Dwight, and is fully confirmed by circumstances and by his descendants. He was opposed to the measures of the Ministry, gave up the use of imported merchandise, and clothed himself and his family in fabrics of domestic manufacture. But he was also opposed to the separation of the Colonies from the

Mother Country. Still he wished to take no part in the conflict of arms. The importunity of friends overruled his own judgment, and he entered the military service of the Crown." If this man was severed from Washington and Hamilton, it was evidently rather by difference of circumstances and connections than by a gulf of principle. On the commercial question, about which the English thought most, he was evidently in favour of Colonial liberty and against the Imperial system.

A special defence of the Puritans would here be hardly in place. Virginia rose as well as New England. The Puritans were the soldiers of Protestantism in its mortal struggle with the Catholic reaction. They saved England, they and Gustavus Adolphus together saved Europe, from being dragged back into the condition of Italy, France, Austria, and Spain. Their character could not fail to contract narrowness and sometimes fierceness from that deadly conflict, though the notion that they lacked culture and that their adversaries were eminent for it is an exploded fiction, and the greatest and most typical of them all, combined with resistless force and fervid intensity of conviction, the largest liberality of mind, the most magnanimous clemency, and the tenderest affection. Dr. Ryerson may depend upon it that his charity and courtesy would have been occasionally disturbed, and he would have been sometimes betrayed into the use of unseemly and unchristian language to opponents, had he been a Protestant living at the time of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew and the Storming of Magdeburg. Intolerance was the vice of the age; and though the ecclesiastical polity of England, as settled by Cromwell, fell far short of our standard of justice, it was at the time the greatest instance of liberality and comprehensiveness which the Christian world had seen. If we are shocked by the intolerance of the Puritans in New England, we must remember that they had planted those settlements in the wilderness at their own cost, and through much suffering, for the purpose of living there under their own religious polity; and that in the infliction of penalties on Non-conformity they aimed, not like Alva and Torquemada, at the forcible conver-

sion of heretics, but only at the exclusion of intruders. The Quakers, who were the greatest sufferers, thrust themselves on the settlements for the very purpose of disturbance. So completely in those days was morality, public as well as private, bound up with religious belief, that it may be doubted whether, without a system of religious discipline such as we should justly condemn as intolerant, it would have been possible to sustain, among bands of wanderers, generally restless and unsubmissive, the political order which was destined to be the organizing force of society in the New World. In the meantime these not unredeemed bigots were founding the system of public schools. Torquemada did not found a system of public schools, nor did Sheldon; nor did the Royal Governors of Colonies in which there were no Puritans.

—The Hon. Alexander Morris has given us a collection of the Treaties with the Indians in the North-West, of which he was a principal framer, and he has added some valuable remarks on that dark subject, the future of the tribes. We have reason to be thankful, so far, for the character of our relations with these people, at least since Canada has been in any measure her own mistress. The early missionaries of Christianity going forth among the barbarous tribes of the North implanted in them, together with a new religion, the germs of a higher civilization, and made them the progenitors of Christendom. This is about the only page of light in the dark history of the dealings of civilized with uncivilized races; and the higher the civilization on one side the more fatal seems the contact to the other. But if the Indian, in presence of the Canadian, has died, he has not been murdered: he has not been poisoned or stalked as a noxious animal like the Australasian or the Kaffir; he has not been goaded into war and butchered for the sake of his land like the Maori and the Zulu. Slight symptoms of trouble in the North-West perhaps there have been; but so far it has been found that fidelity to treaties and kind con-

duct are as effective as the rifle in subduing what the Jingo advocate of extermination called "that most mischievous of all wild animals the wild man." We have so far escaped the horrors of the Indian war in the United States and the brutalizing influence of such conflicts on the character of the civilized race. Perhaps it is just to the Americans to say that the intentions of the government, and of the people generally towards the Indians, have been kind; though they have been always baffled by the roguery of subordinates and the cupidity of the frontiersman. The guilt of destroying the Indian, Canada has escaped; whether anything that her statesmen can do will save him from the doom towards which destiny appears to be hurrying him is far more doubtful. There seems to be a gulf between the nomad and the settled, the hunter and the agriculturalist, which, only under happy circumstances, can be passed. Into that gulf the Indian generally has fallen. He has given up the things which sustained and preserved him in his old state without embracing their substitute in his new state. Of the fitful energy of the hunter, he has lost the energy and retained the fitfulness; he has doffed the hardiness of the child of nature without donning the protecting raiment of civilization. His camp, which, when frequently shifted was healthy, becomes unhealthy when it is made stationary and turned into an uncleansed village. Then come fire-water and small-pox. The sale of the liquor may be prohibited, but to enforce the prohibition in a wild country must be very hard. A bridge to pass the gulf might be afforded by employments intermediate between hunting and agriculture, giving play to the hunter's faculties and in keeping with his energy and hardihood, yet gradually inducing habits of settled industry if enough of such employment could be found. As hunters and trappers under the Hudson's Bay Company, for instance, the Indians seem to have done well and to have accomplished in safety the first steps of the perilous transition. From the life of the hunter to that of a herdsman is a less stride than to that of the farmer. Mr. Morris speaks in sanguine terms of the readiness with

which the Indians avail themselves of agricultural facilities; but the savage, like a child, is easily caught by novelties; what he generally lacks is perseverance. "Induce the Indians," says Mr. Morris, "to erect houses on their farms and plant their gardens, as they call them, and then while away on their hunts their wives and children will have houses to dwell in, and will care for their patches of corn and grain and potatoes." It is to be feared that the corn and grain and potatoes of the hunter will not make much of a show beside those of the regular farmer, and that the loss of a crop or two will be very apt to disgust him with his attempt. Such allotments Mr. Morris prefers to large reservations, as suiting the Indian's local attachment, as less likely to excite the cupidity of the whites, and as dispersing the Indians and rendering them less dangerous, should they become restless, than they would be if collected in a mass. If the patient dies after all, Mr. Morris's book will at least be a proof that the efforts of a kind physician were not wanting.

—The sage who said that he would let others make the laws for a nation if he could be allowed to make its ballads, would have shown still more sagacity if to the ballads he had added the games. A national game cannot fail to exercise a great influence on character. What is the national game of Canada to be—Cricket, Lacrosse, or Base Ball? The result of the recent matches with the Philadelphians, which was mere carnage of Canadian wickets, will do not a little to decide the question against Cricket. In favour of Cricket is British sentiment; but, on the other side, there are many serious objections, the shortness of our summer, its dryness, which renders it difficult to keep the grounds in order, and above all the absence of a leisure class. A cricket-match now takes two or three days. In England there are plenty of men who can afford to play in a game which lasts two or three days, who have nothing else to do, and whose lives are as completely devoted to the sport as that of any professional or more so.

In this country, where all are engaged in making their bread, it is not easy to find a man who can spare even one whole day; and we understand that the Toronto team in its match with the Philadelphians was weakened by the defection of some of its best players. Philadelphia, with its accumulated wealth, has a *jeunesse dorée*, which, though it does not rival in numbers the young squirearchy of England, can more easily supply a team than commercial Young Toronto; besides which the season there is longer. The scale of Cricket, we suspect, has kicked the beam. Lacrosse shall speak for itself, by the lips of Mr. McNaught, the Secretary of the National Lacrosse Association, and the author of "*Lacrosse and How to Play it.*" "The game of Lacrosse," says this gentleman, "has perhaps attracted more attention among young men than any other field sport that has ever been introduced to their notice. That this game, comparatively unknown until within the past few years, should have so suddenly become popular, seems almost a wonder. If ever any game has been persecuted, abused, or belied by envious rivals, that game has certainly been Lacrosse; and yet in spite of all the opposition and ridicule it has received from the adherents of older established sports—in spite of its being declared unscientific, and not at all gentlemanly by those whose notions were rather prudish—this game has, on account of its own intrinsic merits, not only been adopted by *Young Canada* as the *National Game* of the Dominion, but has also won its way high into the favour of athletes, both in England and in the United States. It is affirmed by its opponents that there is no science in the game, it is all hard work, and is injurious to the constitution. A good player seldom hurts himself; it is only the novice who does all the hard work and gets no return for it. Lacrosse is yet in its infancy; the fine points in the game are only now becoming apparent. But the day will come when the public verdict on it, even as a scientific game, will be materially changed, and its opponents be obliged to confess that, measured only by their scientific standards, it will take its place as king of out-door sports,

Lacrosse has so many advantages over other games, that perhaps it will not be out of place to mention a few of them. It is the cheapest of all games. It requires no pads, gauntlets, or other expensive equipments. A single lacrosse-stick and simple running gear, is all that is required for action. It develops the muscles better that any sport we know of. The muscular action is confined to no particular part, as in rowing, skating, or football—it exercises equally the arms, legs and body, and at the same time there is sufficient excitement about it to make it the most fascinating of games. It develops self-reliance, and awakens the energies of all who would excel in it. It is conducive to temperance and sobriety, for no young man can belong to 'a first twelve,' or be a 'crack player' who does not attend to his way of living, and shun entirely the flowing bowl or other vices. It is so simple to look at that any one can readily master its first principles in a few minutes, but to excel at it requires careful and steady practice, which not only acts healthfully on the body, but exercises an exhilarating effect on the mind. The game is always alive, and no player need ever complain that he has not had innings enough. As a matter of fact, it is nearly all innings, if a player only chooses to make it so." Setting aside, in this panegyric, general expressions of the fondness and hope which cannot fail to swell the breast of a Secretary, the points really made in favour of Lacrosse seem to be its cheapness, the ease with which its principles are learned, its general development of the muscles, and its liveliness,—the excitement never flagging and every player having perpetual innings. The last consideration may be extended to the spectators, whose presence and interest, after all, are no small part of a match: it is almost impossible to make a Canadian lady enter into Cricket sufficiently to sit through a game. On the other hand, the weak points of which the Secretary seems partly conscious, which at least he admits have afforded marks for the calumnies of a censorious world, are the roughness of the game and its unscientific character. We hardly know exactly what a

scientific sport is; no doubt Lacrosse affords openings for skill which experience will improve. But we greatly doubt the possibility of ever getting rid of the roughness which bespeaks the Indian parentage of the game, and which when Indians play amounts to a savagery far from pleasant to lookers-on. In most of the games which we have seen, somebody has received a more or less ugly blow. The objection which, as we suspect, will prove most fatal to Lacrosse, is that it will remain confined to "this Canada of ours," and that if it is the national game there will be no international matches. A deadlift effort has been made to import it into England, and by the heroic exertions of Dr. Beers, permission was obtained to play it before the Queen—a consecration which it shared with a great variety of exhibitions. But does anybody believe that it will ever take a place beside Cricket in England or beside Base Ball in the United States? Base Ball has now gained a strong hold upon this Continent, and all the circumstances are in its favour. It can be played through the spring, summer, and fall; it does not require much of a lawn; and what is a greater advantage still, it is quickly played, so that the game is commonly finished in an afternoon. Its liveliness, too, suits the more mercurial temperament of the New World: in this respect it is to Cricket what Euchre is to Whist. We are inclined to think that it is the game of destiny; and that consequently in the course of ages our national characters will be strongly impregnated with the peculiar qualities of the catcher. The loyal Englishman who regards with pensive regret the adoption of a Yankee game may console himself with the thought that Cricket and Base Ball have apparently been evolved out of the same infantine British sport. Trap ball seems to be the primeval germ of both. It was differentiated, as the Spencerians would say, on one side into Cricket, at first with the single wicket, then with the double wicket, and all the science of these athletic days; on the other side into rounders, and so into Base Ball, the highest development of American smartness in the field. Whatever the national game

is to be, a prayer ought to be inserted in the national liturgy that it may remain a game and not fall into professional hands: otherwise the result to the nation will be a race of muscular, alert, and nimble rogues.

This is the age of physical science, of physicism generally, of rehabilitation of the body, and extension of its powers. Christianity itself has become muscular. We have had "walkists," as well as jumpists, rowists, and swimmists, performing unparalleled feats, and now we have a starvist in the person of Dr. Tanner, who has already awakened emulation and been challenged by another starvist to fast fifty days for a large wager. We think we noticed the other day a card from a sleepist who was prepared to sleep against all comers; the use of sermons, Fourth of July orations, and other narcotics being, of course, excluded on both sides. A notice which we read the other day in a bedroom at a hotel seems to imply the possibility of a burnist. "Guests are requested to put out their gas at midnight: if found burning after that hour, they will be charged extra." The ukase seemed severe. No doubt prudent and abstemious people generally put themselves out at midnight; but if a guest likes to go on burning into the small hours, he surely is nobody's enemy but his own. The result of these heroic experiments on the capacity and endurance of the human frame will be watched with interest by those who in the meantime are taking as much exercise as they find good for them, and eating and drinking in moderation what they like till they find that it disagrees with them.

THE BYSTANDER.

SEPTEMBER, 1880.

WE are obliged to go to press just when the news on which we should have most wished to have the opportunity of commenting is expected every hour. It has been joyously proclaimed by the Opposition organ that Sir John Macdonald has failed. He may not have succeeded in his first attempt, but that he has failed, or will fail, we cannot believe. He is the most skilful of negotiators, and he has everything at stake. The state of the English money market is in his favour, and the improved position of the Grand Trunk will somewhat mitigate the strong prejudice against Canadian Railways. Some sort of agreement, we are confident, Sir John Macdonald will bring back with him. Whatever it is, it is condemned beforehand by those who said that his failure would "be inspiriting to every true Canadian." Their cue will most likely be to exaggerate the value of the land, and contend that it has been thrown away. But land is of value only when opened up, and a single railway can hardly be said to open up more than a belt of fifty miles. The mass of our people will, as we believe, irrespectively of party and the rivalries of politicians, welcome any reasonable settlement which will relieve the country of the peril. We may differ very much on political questions, but we all abhor bankruptcy. We may vary in our speculative views as to the future destiny of the country, but we all desire that Canada should remain her own mistress, and that her pos-

ition among the nations should be settled by her own will and not by the pressure of financial disaster.

—In the dead season of politics, Ministerial journals employ their leisure in exposing the discrepancies and inconsistencies of the Opposition creed. They enjoy the satisfaction of going through the list of leading questions, and finding that on no one of them are the Opposition leaders and organs agreed saving the duty of hating Sir John Macdonald. Perhaps even on that point practical unanimity hardly prevails. But the Opposition is just now changing its skin: it is casting off the slough of Gritism: soon it will come forth renovated and burnished in Liberal youth. To mix our metaphors: the fleet is going over from the Grit to the Liberal tack: the sheets of the London *Advertiser* have filled, and it is cutting the water merrily; while some of its consorts are hanging, and two or three, perhaps, will forever hang, in stays. Candour, however, must admit that there is more than this. There is an extensive fermentation of public opinion on questions which neither of the parties has hitherto taken up, though they are the great questions of the future. It is natural that the Liberal party should be the more affected of the two by this movement, and that it should betray symptoms of half conviction and vacillation, from which a party of resistance to all movement is free. In time, opinion will settle, and those who comprehend the situation, and know their own minds, will, as usual, take a decisive lead. In the meantime, Parliamentary history is full of proofs that an Opposition, divided on some questions, may still find a point of united attack. Mr. Blake may give battle on the Coal Tax without touching the Senate or Commercial Union.

With regard to the question of the Senate, we confess that we ourselves occupy a position in which it would be difficult for us to frame a mere party motion. That the system of two Chambers is a mistake, having its origin in a total misconception as to the nature of the House of Lords, is a conviction in

which we are confirmed by all that occurs either in the European Legislatures or in those of the British Colonies. The House of Lords is the chamber of a territorial aristocracy, as it is now showing in a signal manner; it represents and guards certain interests, distinct from those of the great body of the nation. In countries where there is no territorial aristocracy there are no real materials for an Upper Chamber. Sometimes, as in Victoria, a senate becomes the organ of a special interest, and is rendered noxious as well as odious thereby. Whatever of high character and mature wisdom a nation possesses ought, if possible, to be sent to the assembly in which supreme power, under the elective system, must centre, there to control and guide the real councils of the nation. In Victoria, and wherever the Senate has become the organ of a special interest, the results have been collisions and dead-locks; elsewhere the Senate has been a nullity, or, rather, it has done mischief by concealing the want of a real Conservative element in the Constitution; nowhere has it fulfilled its ideal function as a body of mature wisdom regulating and tempering legislation. In Canada it has rendered no service at all commensurate to its cost; it is filled with superannuated partisans, and is hardly anything more than an addition to the bribery fund of party. Very little would be lost by simple abolition. But, if we could have our way, the abolition would be accompanied with a general revision of the Constitution, of which the Senate is a part, with a view to actually supplying those securities for deliberate legislation which the Senate is vainly supposed to afford. We would have both the mode of election to the House of Commons and the mode of doing business there so regulated as to make that House itself, if possible, a Senate, in the best sense of the term. We would introduce regular election of the Executive Council by the Legislature instead of putting up the great offices of State as the prizes of a faction fight which turns a deliberative assembly into a cockpit. We would try at the same time to take the elections out of the hands of the wire-pullers, and restore them immediately or mediately to

those of the people. These, it will be at once said, are the impracticable reveries of doctrinaires. Possibly, but as it is the unexpected that always happens, so it is the impracticable that in the end is always done.

—Having the national fish to sell our Prime Minister seems to have thought it lawful to do everything in his power to propitiate the market. If he is rightly reported, he told the guests at the Trinity House dinner that every man in Canada between 18 and 45 was a soldier, and that this mighty host, in number about double the regular army of England, was in a perfect state of organization. Had we been there, we should have loyally backed up our Chieftain's statement, and declared that every man of the force was thoroughly drilled, armed, and provided with uniform and accoutrements; that the officers, commissioned and non-commissioned, were perfectly trained to their duties; that the cavalry was exceeded in strength and efficiency only by the artillery; that the commissariat and the ambulances were ready for the field at a moment's notice, and that the country voted with enthusiasm four hundred millions annually for the pay. Next morning all this would have been repeated in the English papers as an important and gratifying proof that the military resources of the Empire were far greater than was commonly supposed. If it had been added that the men were all more than six feet high and that their ordinary diet was cariboo, which accounted for their remarkable agility, this would have been believed as well as the rest. He is a wise Canadian militiaman who knows his own colonel. A late judge whose weight avoirdupois equalled the weight of his authority as a lawyer, was an officer of light infantry; yet few were in the secret. How the chieftain's audience would be taken aback by his urgent call for British troops on the outbreak of a Russian war, and how nimbly would his prolific fancy supply an excuse for the entire disappearance of his perfectly organized legions! Yet Lord Kimberley evidently shares

the illusion. We sometimes wonder whether the Colonial office has any means of obtaining trustworthy information at all, or picks up its knowledge on the luncheon ground at Wimbledon. A correspondent at Cape Town told us long ago that the case of South African Confederation was hopeless, giving the decisive reasons against the practicability of the scheme: evidently he spoke the mind of all men of sense on the spot. Yet the Colonial office, kept by a few flatterers under the dominion of a strong delusion, plunged on through blood and ruin to certain failure. The present Colonial Secretary plainly has not a notion that, in cheering us on to expenditure in politico-military railways, he is endangering our financial solvency, or that a blow given to our financial solvency may shake the half cemented edifice of Confederation.

While we are talking of martial affairs let us repel the insinuation of a malicious contemporary that the *Bystander* must, of course, be opposed to sending a team to Wimbledon because it is Jingo, inasmuch as the Canadian marksmen "are showing how unerringly they would send a bullet through the body of a Frenchman, a Russian or a Yankee." The *Bystander* trusts that he is not so deficient in proper bloodthirstiness as not to revel in the thought of sending a bullet through a Yankee's body, though, it must be owned, the scores at Wimbledon suggest the possibility that the Yankee might, with his usual forgetfulness of decorum, send his bullets through ours. But smallbore shooting is not allied to anything sanguinary or unchristian; if we may trust the opinion of our military friends, it is more nearly allied to playing billiards. Canadian oarsmen, though their sport is less military in appearance, are probably, providing more of the real material for an army than our marksmen.

—Our late Governor-General appears to be, socially, as great a hit in Russia as he was here. "While the other ambassadors in St. Petersburg have contented themselves with very mixed society, Lord Dufferin has entertained none but the most aris-

tocratic and select. So exclusive are his receptions that even some members of the diplomatic corps are not admitted to the more private ones. The Dufferin receptions have been much talked of naturally, especially in connection with the charades that are acted at them. The host himself is the central figure of these entertainments. He throws himself into the thing with the greatest ardour. One day, for instance, he welcomed his guests in the costume of a cupid—pink tights, wings and quiver, all complete. On another occasion he donned a Scotch costume and appeared bare-legged. In some charade or other it was one night necessary to work in the word "river." Lord Dufferin calmly piled up a heap of chairs, climbed to the top of one of them, took off his dress-coat, waistcoat and white necktie, threw himself flat on the floor, and began moving his arms and legs about frantically, like a swimmer in distress. He then got up, and beckoning to the band to strike up, opened the ball in a waltz with Lady Dufferin. The originality of these entertainments and the systematic exclusion of all outside the pale of the most aristocratic society in the Empire made a great sensation." Such is the picture Correspondents give.

"He throws himself into the thing with the greatest ardour," and, we may be sure, with unparalleled success. In St. Petersburg "the thing" is exclusiveness combined with frivolity. In Canada "the thing" was Spread-Beaver. How Lord Dufferin threw himself into Spread-Beaver stands recorded in his speeches, which are at once about the prettiest pieces of rhetoric of their sort and the most remarkable monuments of the capacity of the human mind for absorbing flattery and exaggeration. The effect was not confined to the passing hour, nor did it pass away with the exhilaration of the champagne; a joyous impulse was given to the policy of Pacific Railways and general inflation, out of which the Prime Minister is now trying to find a way. That Mr. Mackenzie, sober-minded as he is, yielded to the spell like the rest, his expenditure in British Columbia and his Military College at Kingston seem to prove.

—We trust that the ire of Sir Francis Hincks has abated. The knights of old were called upon to display chivalrous courtesy and command of temper in the tilting yard: he is called upon to display them in the literary tourney. Government paper currency, to which he is so much attached, and our want of attachment to which caused him to explode, or as our cousins say, to erupt, has surely furnished food for reflection on this continent. It is needless to rehearse the history of the Legal Tender Act in the United States, or to say what its effects were on the national finances, on public credit, on the faith of private contracts, or commercial and general morality. There is probably not a man of sense now in the Republic who does not most heartily wish that the politicians had been as honest as the people, and stuck to the straightforward policy of laying on as large an amount of taxation as the community could bear, and borrowing what more they wanted upon their credit, which would then have remained sound. A practical deduction of at least a third from the burden of the debt would have been the smallest of the benefits which would thus have been secured, and which were forfeited by raising a forced loan under the guise of issuing unconvertible paper, and making it legal tender. Generations may pass away before the United States will have thoroughly worked the mischief out of their commercial system; nor will it be less difficult to expel from the social frame the evil habits contracted during the war by the reckless expenditure of phantom wealth.* As to the South American

* "By a remarkable delusion our people came to regard the paper money, every note of which was a certificate and reminder of indebtedness and loss of property, as a real and boundless addition to our wealth, which not only made good our material losses, but made us far richer than we had been before the war. Under the influence of this astounding error the people and the Government plunged at once into reckless extravagance and expenditure, thus greatly increasing the loss which the nation had suffered by the war. . . . This extravagance and the delusion which fostered it had some important results in the domain of morals. Manual labour came to be regarded as in a great measure unnecessary, and to be despised as a badge of inferiority by many who had always been engaged in it. Multitudes of men, who had until then honestly earned or produced their living by the work of their hands, now began to live by their wits, by starting and controlling business

Governments, and the coloured gentlemen who preside over the finances of St. Domingo, they have so regulated the paper currency that it needs a strong man to carry a dollar in paper home. And now Canada has taken the first step in the same descent by empowering her Government to issue eight millions of legal tender paper, convertible indeed, but without a proportionate reserve. This Sir Francis Hincks condemns, though he seems disposed to reserve the prerogative of condemnation to himself.

It is the business of the Government to put its stamp on the coin, as an assurance that the piece is of a certain weight and fineness. You take your gold, if you please, to the mint and get it back stamped in the shape of sovereigns. There is nothing of fiat about this, more than about any other stamp or certificate of value. Happily Governments may now be trusted to discharge this function honestly. In former days they were in the habit of stealing a portion of the gold and substituting

---

enterprises for the investment of other peoples' money, and by taking Government contracts and corporation jobs. The abounding dishonesty which has since then been our curse, the repudiation of the debts of States, towns, and cities, with the alarming development of the disposition to steal trust funds,—these and other unfavourable elements in the life of the time had their source and main impulse in the delusion about the nature and powers of paper money, in the uncertainty of its value, and in the extravagance engendered by the war. A passionate greed for riches was developed among our people. Men had no longer any vision for realities, but built upon illusions and impossibilities as if they were the solid facts and laws of nature. The leading clergymen and writers of the nation encouraged and defended this enormous and reckless acquisitiveness, and talked in philosophical phrases about the aspirations of the masses for improved conditions, leisure for culture, and a higher civilization. The pulpit gave to luxury the sanction of religion, and the press urged the people onward in their career of extravagance, in the name of patriotism, and declared the national debt a national blessing. It was not to be effected that the working-men should be wiser than their teachers. The increase of wages for all kinds of manual labour was very great, but comparatively few of the working-men saved anything. They imitated the profusion of their employers and guides. Economy was deemed unnecessary, stupid, and mean. New wants were invented: prudence and simplicity of life went out of fashion; and habits were formed and sentiments adopted which have wrought most important changes in the character and aims of the working men of this country. The sheer wastefulness of that period, if it could be adequately portrayed, would appear incredible to all who did not witness it." *From* "Certain Dangerous Tendencies in American Life."

base metal. To show what tricks people are capable of playing with their understandings on this subject, a historian styles the debasement of the currency by Henry VIII. "a loan from the Mint," and treats it as a perfectly legitimate measure of finance, in face of the facts that commerce was thrown into confusion by this royal embezzlement, and that the restoration of the coin was one of the glories of Elizabeth. Mr. Finlay ascribes the wonderful vitality of the Byzantine Empire partly to its commercial ascendancy, which again he attributes to the wisdom of its Government in steadfastly maintaining the integrity of the coin.

But Bank Bills, once more, are not coin nor "money," which means the product of a Mint: they are notes promising to pay coin, and like other paper, instruments of commerce. Why is Government to issue them, any more than promissory notes of the ordinary kind? In order that it may appropriate the profit? But why should Government be bound to appropriate the profit of issuing Bank Bills any more than that of discounting, or receiving deposits, or selling exchange? A commercial community is made up of different trades, each earning its profits in its own line of business, and the Banker's trade is one like the rest. Why, we ask, should it be the duty of the Government to transfer to itself the profits of this particular trade? No reason, we suspect, can be given which would not resolve itself into a confused notion that Bank Bills are money, and that to issue them is the province of Government because Government stamps the coin. As to regulating the circulation, in the first place that is a function entirely distinct from making a profit by issuing Bank Bills, and supposing the thing to be practicable, would perhaps be better committed to the hands of some independent authority above trade and profit altogether. But, in the second place, we must ask once more, how can the amount of paper requisite for commercial transactions in any community be regulated otherwise than by the current demands of commerce? How can a Government possibly foresee the number and amount of transactions? How, without

such prevision, can it possibly determine the volume of paper which it is desirable to issue? Banks obey, and cannot help obeying, the natural law of supply and demand in their issue department as well as in the rest. But what is there to guide a Government? What guided our Finance Minister when he determined on a sudden to issue additional paper to the extent of eight millions? This is what we want to know.

There are Governments and Governments. A thoroughly commercial Government like that of France or Holland in former times, or that of England in the present day, might, perhaps, be safely trusted with the power of issuing paper. But a demagogic Government, to which democracy in its crude state is always liable, cannot be safely trusted with such a power. We see what demagogic Governments have done. We see that Sir Leonard Tilley, a man whose personal integrity is beyond question, when pressed by political necessity, proceeds, under colour of inflating the currency, to levy a forced loan. We know what was done by Secretary Chase, though his character stood very high. No wild cat bank has ever exceeded in profligacy or in mischievousness the doings of certain governments in this line; so very far is a national currency, as it is styled, from affording extraordinary security to the people. On the Banks you have a hold; you can compel them to keep a sufficient reserve of coin or conform to any other rules that you think fit; and you can enforce the penalty for their defaults: nobody has any interest in screening them: the politicians, on the contrary, seeing that they are objects of popular jealousy and envy, are always ready for an attack on them. But a party Government has only to appeal to its majority in order to be relieved from all restrictions and exempted from all penalties; and experience shows that it will commonly do, either in the way of issuing bad paper or in any other way, whatever it thinks necessary to keep it in power. Sir Leonard Tilley is able to increase his issue without increasing his reserve; if he pleases he can do it again: perhaps his less scrupulous successors may do it till there is practically no reserve at all. Not the politicians saved the United States

(if indeed the United States have been saved) from Greenbackism and Repudiation, but the honesty and good sense of the people, aided by the Press, which rose above the party level on this occasion. The politicians were ready for anything that would bring them votes, from the Dollar of the Fathers to downright Repudiation. The allegation of the National Currency men that the Government is responsible while the Banks are irresponsible, is unfortunately the very reverse of the truth.

Sir Francis seems to think that it is great presumption on our part to have an opinion about the Bank Charter Act. It is impossible to have been in the thick of the discussion when the Act was on its trial without forming some notion of it, however imperfect and erroneous. We are aware that it has not been repealed, though it has been thrice suspended, (in 1847, 1857, and 1866), and these suspensions, to say the least, are not a proof of its perfect adaptation to all commercial circumstances. That of which Sir Francis Hincks does not seem so distinctly aware is that the Act has not yet really gone into operation. Peel contemplated the extinction of all note issues save that of the Bank of England, and expected the process to be rapid; instead of which there are still more than 170 banks of issue remaining in England, while in Scotland and Ireland the old system remains unchanged. The Act was the offspring of the alarm caused by Bank crashes; but we have never seen any proof that stricter Bank Laws would not have been the better as well as the more obvious remedy. Each suspension has been full of injustice to the houses which had been allowed to fall before the interposition. We have said before that in times of alarm the Act seems to produce a sort of hysterical contraction which aggravates the panic. Still the Charter was a *bona fide* attempt to regulate the currency in the public interest: it was not a plan for bringing profit to the Government, much less for replenishing the exchequer from an illicit source; while the character of the Legislature, on which commerce has a firm hold, and the relations between the Government and the Bank

of England, to which there is nothing analogous here, afford a sufficient security against any wild cat measures.

That this dangerous power will ever be wrested out of the hands of our politicians is in the last degree improbable. So far as that goes, Sir Francis Hincks may be comforted. But the use of the power may possibly be kept within some sort of bounds by the united action, whenever action is required, of all who have the interests of commercial industry at heart. Our commercial institutions, on the whole, are sound, and have been proved to be so by the searching ordeal of the crisis through which we have just passed: they are administered by commercial men, thoroughly acquainted with the subject, who have themselves to bear the consequences of mismanagement. Our political institutions are not so sound: they may, and we hope will, work off their defects, but at present they are in the hands of Party, which when hard pressed will do anything, while Governments are too ephemeral to feel much responsibility for the future. To bring that which is sound more under the influence of that which is unsound would not be the wisest policy.

The Government paper, though not unconvertible—at that point happily we have not yet arrived—is Legal Tender. Why should anybody's paper be Legal Tender? That is a question to which we have never seen a good answer, and to which it is most desirable to have one, for Legal Tender lies at the root of the notion that the Government has power to create money by fiat, and of all the dangerous chimeras which that notion brings in its train. If Sir Francis Hincks is in favour of Legal Tender, he is a Greenbacker, or a Beaverbacker, *in posse*. If the paper is good, nobody will refuse it: if it is doubtful, why is anybody to be compelled to take it. Supposing a creditor so eccentric as to refuse Bank of England notes, and prefer to encumber himself with a half a hundred weight of gold, he can be accommodated by taking the notes to the Bank of England. The principles of commercial justice are the same in all cases and extend to the dealings of a Government as well as to those of private traders, though a Government which breaks them can

snap its fingers at remonstrance and a private trader cannot. We really can see no public convenience in Legal Tender, or any reason why the promissory notes of a Government should be forced currency any more than its Exchequer Bills or its Bonds; while we do see a bad principle, and one of the most dangerous kind. But our distinguished critic, we apprehend, is himself the author of the system in this country. He set the example, as Finance Minister, of making profit by the issue of Government paper. From him to Sir Leonard Tilley is a natural step in the financial Rake's Progress. He, like a hen, has sat on the duck's egg and hatched the inauspicious bird which he now, with maternal horror, sees taking to its natural element of Inflation.

As our eminent financial contemporary, the *Monetary Times*, says, this question is still dangerous. It is difficult to understand the prevalence of the fiat money fallacy. It is difficult to understand how an artisan can fancy that he would be the gainer by being paid his wages in paper for which no one would give him a loaf of bread. No doubt he would see many richer men than himself, who have loaned their money, ruined; and this might gratify his feelings; but it would hardly mend his condition, especially if he was employed in producing anything that rich men buy. No sane man surely can think that a bill is based upon that into which it is not convertible, or that bills issued by the Government could be convertible into the general wealth of the country, which belongs not to the Government but to private owners. If it be said that the Government has the power of taxing all the property, and thus satisfying its creditors, the question meets us, in what are the taxes to be collected. In the Government paper? Then you will have nothing after all but paper to give the public creditor, and you may as well dispense with an illusory form. In gold? Then you come back to a gold basis in the end. But the truth is that through the monetary fallacies glimmers legalized Repudiation, and this it is that gives the fallacies their vogue.

—The phrase "National" applied to Currency evidently has a charm. "National" ought to have a charm whenever it denotes attachment to the community as opposed to anything sectional or selfish. But in this case it seems to be closely connected with the Socialistic desire for "a strong government," which we find expressed in journals and addresses appealing to the working-men. A strong government, in plain language, is a despotism; only it is to be a despotism animated by the sentiments, and acting in the interests, of the artisan class. Consequently, it would be the enemy of the other classes; the other classes would fight for their rights and their property, and it is doubtful, to say the least, whether the military force of the community resides in the artisan. But the fact is that a despotism, whatever its origin, once set up, is apt to act in nobody's interest but its own, and to ally itself with that class which is most willing to support its authority. In France a strong government, elected by universal suffrage, with Democratic and semi-Socialistic professions, came into supreme power under a revolutionary flag; and its first step was to deport the leaders of the working classes by thousands to Lambessa and Cayenne; after which, without entirely laying aside its pretension to a democratic or even a semi-socialistic character, it proceeded to govern in the interest of the rich generally, and especially of the stock-jobbers. Massaniello was a tyrant before he had been in power for a day, and Kearney, if he could become supreme, would repeat the history of Massaniello. We have had specimens on a small scale, of strong governments set up by the votes of the artisans, and for their supposed benefit, in most of the cities of this continent; and what has the result been? It has been a general domination of men like Tweed, who have made immense fortunes by theft, and outvied in vulgar luxury the shoddy rich, their chosen associates, while not a thought has been given the habitations or the condition of the poor. The world is not what we would wish it to be, but liberty has done most to improve it. Experience bids us cast away for ever the thought of class gov-

ernment, whether the class be that of the aristocrat or that of the artizan, and try rather to make society a community indeed.

— That which concerns ninety-nine people in a hundred a good deal more than any political question is the fall in the rate of interest. This was evidently coming. The banks have reduced the rate on deposits, and the general rise in stocks and shares may be taken to be partly a direct consequence of this measure, partly a consequence of the commercial conditions by which the measure was enforced. The mortgage rate in this country is down to 6, in the United States it is down to 5, or even, for short periods, to 4. English Consols sell at prices that yield 3 per cent., United States Bonds at prices that yield 3½ per cent., while French Fives sell at 120. It is stated that in England two hundred millions sterling seek investment. At Quebec, we learn, bankers and large capitalists are in despair; large deposits have been refused; the banks have reduced their rate of interest to 3 per cent., and the best paper is freely discounted at 5, or even 4½ per cent., ordinary paper at 6 or 7. The whole commercial world appears to be surcharged with accumulated capital. During the thirty years of great manufacturing and railway-building activity immense accumulations of profits took place; and this money, the supply of everything having outrun the demand, and the construction of railways and other works having for the time found its limit, lies for the present without profitable employment. In these days of almost automatic machinery, the instruments of production are created with a rapidity unknown when a large number of additional hands had to be procured and trained; and the consequence is that in prosperous times the volume of production increases at a prodigious rate. Governments will, no doubt, take advantage of the state of the money market to reduce the interest on their debts, and the possibilities of profitable investment will thus be still further diminished. How long this state of

things will last is a serious problem for buyers of stock and for those who live on the interest of such investments. In the United States the best authorities seem to think that the renewed activity of commerce will soon create a larger demand for money, and that the rate of interest will rise again. Of course, the surplus produce, in the way of manufactures, so far as that is the cause of this state of things, will be worked off and production will recommence. But there is that vast reservoir of money in England ready to overflow unless some outlet is found for it. Will any new demand for capital on a large scale present itself, like the construction of the railway system, or the clothing and equipment of the armies in the Prusso-Austrian and Franco-German wars? Will the Turkish Empire, when disencumbered of its deadly Government and opened to commercial enterprise afford a field for a great outlay? Will any Government borrow again? The Government of India apparently will have to borrow a few millions, but this is a trifle. On the whole, it is difficult to see what is to raise the rate of interest again for some time to come. One thing seems certain: capital, especially English capital, having been forced to go so far afield for profitable investments, the rate of interest in different countries will be equalized more than it has hitherto been. The days of ten, and even of eight, per cent. in Canada are probably over.

—Our good-tempered critic, the London *Free Press*, rallies us on what he flatters himself is the death of our favourite hobby, Commercial Union. This is always the way with great practical politicians. They see very clearly the backward sweep of the wave at the spot where they stand, and they take it for the turn of the tide. To choose an example from a larger field, after Novarra, all the great practical politicians of Europe thought there was an end of the dream of Italian independence: after 1848, they thought there was an end of the dream of a United Germany. On which side are the great forces? If the

question is economical, as that of Commercial Union is, on which side are the great Commercial interests ? This question answered, the rest is a matter of time. The time may be long if the secondary forces or interests which tend to delay the event are many and strong; but at last the event will come. Commercial Union will come, if the great interests of the two nations concerned are on its side. It will come in spite of any amount of anxious and uneasy prediction to the contrary, of any amount of denunciation. There is not a more instructive passage in Burke, than that in which, while he is desperately combatting the advance of the new order of things, the feeling suddenly comes over him that resistance is hopeless, and that he cannot put off the hour of fate. "If a great change is to be made in human affairs, the minds of men will be fitted to it; the general opinions and feelings will draw that way. Every fear, every hope will forward it; and then they who persist in opposing this mighty current in human affairs, will appear rather to resist the decrees of Providence itself than the mere designs of men." For the same reasons, every statesman who has satisfied himself that a great change is desirable, and must come, will be content to allow opinion to ripen, and the secondary forces, especially if they are sentimental, to expend their power of resistance in the natural way. Let the *Free Press* prove that Commercial Union would not be a good thing for the two sections of this continent, especially for the Canadian farmers in its neighbourhood, and we will invite it to the funeral which it says is so scantily attended; a mere momentary recoil, even if there really were one, would not disturb our conviction in the slightest degree. But from our point of view no recoil is visible. Instead of receding, the doctrine appears to us to gain ground in the Press, even in the Party Press, which speaks under the restraint of discipline. Our critic thinks to confound us by asking, "How many journals have declared for Commercial Union?" We reply by asking him how many journals had declared for the National Policy five years before it came, and how many declared from the begin-

ning against the Pacific Railway as a Government work? The Press too, to bring it round, requires time.

—A well-informed correspondent tells us that we have not done justice to the scope of the Pacific Railway Commission, and the intentions of the Minister who appointed it. If we find when its report appears that we have underrated its probable usefulness, we shall certainly acknowledge the error: fallibility is our line. But all we said was that to give it authority in judicially deciding between the late Government and the present, the Commission should have been appointed when Parliament was sitting, so that opportunity might have been given for discussion. These Commissions of Inquiry are useful, but in appointing them, as in the exercise of any other prerogative, there are certain rules to be observed. With all due deference to Mr. Alpheus Todd be it said, no Royal Commission can be allowed to meddle with any question which belongs to Parliament as the Grand Inquest of the nation, especially when Parliament is already seized of the inquiry; and if a Royal Commission should hereafter meddle with any such matter, it will be the duty of Parliament to refuse to receive the report, and itself to proceed with the inquiry as though the Commission had no existence. It is to be wished, no doubt, that Parliaments were better constituted for performing a judicial duty; but nothing will be gained by transferring its functions to a Party Government, particularly if the conduct of that Government is itself the subject of investigation. Wherever the duties of a Commission are to be quasi-judicial, or where party considerations can at all come in, justice and true policy will alike dictate a frank communication to Parliament, and a fair representation of both parties in the Commission. In any case, care should be taken that every considerable body of opinion has its voice.

There is another little constitutional question on which there is a word to be said. We cannot help thinking, with the Toronto

Telegram, that the issuing of election writs, as soon as a vacancy occurs, ought to be prescribed by law, and not left to the discretion, that is, to the electioneering convenience, of a Party Government. An emergency requiring Parliament to be summoned may any day occur, and it is not right that a constituency should be left without its representatives, while the wirepullers are fighting over the nomination, or some sham candidate is haggling about his withdrawal fee. These things, like the more serious affair of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, point to the necessity in our case of a written constitution, explicitly defining all functions and limiting all powers. Unwritten understandings are very well in a country where they are understood, where tradition has been fixed by immemorial usage, and is enforced by settled opinion; but in a new country, if you give men legal powers they will be apt to use them to the utmost, especially under the stress of party conflict, and the only way to prevent exorbitancy, is to render it impossible by law.

—Principal Grant, of Queen's College, has concluded the last of a very pleasant series of papers on Canada in *Scribner's Monthly*, illustrated in Scribner's admirable style, by giving his reasons for believing that Canada will maintain her present relations towards England and the United States. He thinks that those who hold that the economical forces will in the end prevail have "never taken full account of the depth and power of popular sentiment." Popular sentiment is a thing of which there is no exact gauge. We are all of us apt to believe that our sentiments are popular: we know that they ought to be, and we charitably conclude that they are. Forty thousand Canadians, at the least, will have testified to the ascendancy of the economical forces this year by migrating in quest of better land or higher wages to the United States. If you had asked these people before they went leading questions about their sentiments, you would have gone away satisfied that every one

of them was invincibly attached to Monarchical institutions, and determined never to live under a Republican flag. "Sentiment," says Principal Grant, with much force and beauty, "is the strongest thing in human nature; it binds the family and nations together, and rules the world." To befit a reasoning being, however, it must have a rational basis, and it seldom, as we believe, survives the usefulness of an institution. Even the blind loyalty of a clansman would not last long if his chief ceased to be his protector. Sentiment, in short, is the bloom on the fruit of beneficence: it cannot subsist without the fruit. There is something, says Principal Grant, kinglier than cotton. But what does cotton, if that is a sarcastic name for national prosperity, mean? It means not only a full belly and a warm back, but the respect for law which attends the possession of property, the kindly feelings which go with contentment, a bright home with domestic affections, early marriage, a nice wife, a circle of happy children. In this there is a good deal of sentiment, if not of romance, while there is often much that is far from sentimental or romantic in the hovel of bare-legged fealty. To Principal Grant it appears that the decisive feature of the situation is the thought which he supposes to be present to the minds of all Canadians that if we joined the United States we might possibly be called on to fight against the Mother Country. To how many of the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who are now on the other side of the line did this horrible idea ever present itself? We will venture to say not to one of them. A war with the United States is a notion which, in spite of all the official drumming and trumpeting, nobody can be induced practically to entertain. Even at the time of the American civil war, when there appeared to be some danger of a rupture between the United States and England, Canadians enlisted by thousands in the army of the United States.

Principal Grant admits that the case would be changed if effect could be given to a conception which he ascribes to the late Joseph Howe, and that there could be "some kind of alliance or league of all the English-speaking peoples." Formal alliance

or league, in all probability, there will never be. What could be the objects or conditions of it? What special interests, commercial or diplomatic, have the English-speaking peoples in common, apart from the rest of humanity? The measure of political arrangements is convenience; and a political federation spanning all the oceans and embracing communities in all the quarters of the globe is a chimera really as senseless as any that enters the head of an Oriental despot under the inspiring influence of bang. People who indulge in these day-dreams mistake politics for religion, science or affection. But a moral league or alliance there will be; it is, in fact, growing daily, and the sentiment inspired by it is gradually superseding the narrower and less genial sentiment bred by the Revolutionary quarrel, as even the tone of Principal Grant in this passage of his work shows. Let U. E. Loyalism work away with its reminiscences of Lundy's Lane as hard as it will; Lundy's Lane was a signal exhibition of the obstinate valour of the Anglo-Saxon race in fraternal strife: but before Lundy's Lane were the defeat of the Armada, Blenheim, Dettingen, Quebec, in which our fathers, and the fathers of the English over the line, stood as Englishmen side by side. To fight sentiment with argument is folly; it is reasoning with the unconvincable: but the flame of sentiment, unfed by reason and utility, will die; and there cannot be a sentiment the flame of which is less fed by reason or utility than that which was kindled by the wretched quarrel of 1765.

In one instance, at all events, Principal Grant must allow that popular sentiment in Canada has been mis-read by those who might have been expected to read it aright. Like a man of sense he scoffs at the idea of importing aristocracy into Canada. Yet there can be no doubt that the erection of a Court and the shower of titles were a part of the Tory Premier's general policy, or that he was advised by those whose information he had every reason to trust that Canada was ripe for the experiment. The leading organ of our Government proclaimed that this was the most aristocratic of all colonies. Nevertheless the

experiment fizzled: the word is homely, but there is no other so expressive. Of the Court part of it, though we have heard enough, we will say nothing, because it is difficult to speak without a violation of the hospitable courtesy which is due, and which our people have unanimously desired to show in unstinted measure to the Governor-General and his Royal Consort. Those high personages have, probably, by this time formed their own opinion as to the value of court life when conjured into existence in such a capital as Ottawa, by the wand of Professor Fanning. As for the other part of the scheme, we will hazard the opinion that if a member of Parliament next session were to move an address to the Crown against the granting of any more titles, he would find that he had not impaired his popularity. A philosophic study of history has taught us to give all phases of humanity and all the successive forms of political life their due, not approving or condemning absolutely, but in relation to time and circumstance. Aristocracy was perhaps the necessary organization of a feudal kingdom with unintelligent masses, provinces imperfectly united, no regular legal system, no centralized administration. The titles in those days were official, not simply territorial, much less mere badges of social exclusiveness; they denoted needful duties really performed to the state. It is needless to add that the titles of chivalry, which are thrown as crumbs to the vanity of colonists, are about as laughable an instance of perversion and debasement as the whole museum of historical curiosities affords. A man who chooses to parade in such antique gew-gaws, ought to be made to carry out the joke and wear an iron pot on his head with the thermometer at a hundred. Where opinions differ it is useless to dogmatize; but there are not a few to whom, even in Europe itself, aristocracy, its original functions having passed away with Feudalism, seems to have become an almost unmixed nuisance. Politically, it is a standing conspiracy against progress, not in the interest of order or of caution but in the interest of class, and its reactionary efforts are in fact productive, not of safe and sober

councils, but of dangerous convulsions. On the famous 16th of May, it all but plunged France in civil war; and in England it has lately been doing its best to divert the minds of the people from domestic reforms by driving the nation into a course of wild and immoral adventure abroad. Create a privileged order and you are sure to find it arrayed against the interests of the community. Nor does the mischief stop there. In an aristocratic country, the spirit of exclusiveness extends downwards through all the grades of society, drawing artificial lines, and setting class against class, embittering by social estrangement industrial conflicts and economical antagonism of every-kind. The employer as well as the duke plays the aristocrat to those under him; the farmer and the farmer's wife play the aristocrat to the labourer; and the upper servants in a household play the aristocrat to the lower. A paper published in one of the London suburbs was complaining the other day, that it was impossible to get up a High School, because the children of clerks were too aristocratic to go to school with the children of the tradesmen. Wealth is taught, instead of seeking popularity by munificence, to seek admission to the privileged order by lavish expenditure and political corruption. We speak of the institution and its effects: nobody denies that kindness and beneficence are to be found, often in large measure, among the lords and ladies of England. Nor can we believe that the evil is compensated by any great good. Every report of the betting ring and the Divorce Court shows that titles are no security for morals. They are not even security for manners, though people who always have deference paid them naturally acquire a certain dignity which they preserve till something comes to disturb it. In *Vanity Fair*, the special organ of aristocratic sentiment, we read:—

"A most disgraceful scene took place last week at Newmarket. A number of ladies of high position and rank, and well-known in society, assembled after dinner, at the house of one of their number to play baccarat. The hostess took the bank, together with a gentleman of the party; but at her first deal an objec-

tion was made to her manner of dealing. She dealt again, when another point was raised, and thereupon ensued the most discreditable 'row' that probably ever took place between ladies. Smoking and swearing, the heroines of the affair hurled every kind of uncomplimentary remark to each other for the space of something like half-an-hour, to the great fright of such of them as still retained the ordinary timidity of womanhood. At length the 'row' ended, but so great an effect was produced by it that it was thought necessary by the hostess to ask an exalted personage to come down and play the next night at the house in order to rehabilitate it and her—which the personage was good-naturedly pleased to do. It is right to add that the hostess herself is said to have acted properly throughout. But the point is that it is a simple disgrace that ladies should gamble at all in this business-like and professional manner; that it is doubly disgraceful that they should gamble as they do with mere paper; and that it is trebly disgraceful for them to adopt the manners of scullery-maids, and the language of coal-heavers. While this scene was taking place inside, the crowd were engaged in killing a policeman outside, while the doors were not even shut. It reminds one of the preliminary scenes of the French Revolution." The rowdy mob beating the policeman to death outside is the natural concomitant to the scene within. When refinement is a matter of privilege, the unprivileged are sure to be exceedingly coarse. However, let aristocracy be what it will on its native soil. Transplanted to ours it would be a upas tree of vulgar vanity and servile flunkeyism: that even our brief and limited experience has been enough to show. As a Conservative force it would be a mere delusion, like other artificial importations of Old-World state, which merely serve, as we have said, to mask the necessity of developing Conservative forces of an effective kind. Wise, therefore, have the people been in summarily rejecting it. But we repeat there was a serious attempt to introduce it, which showed that, even by those who should be the best authorities, popular sentiment may be utterly misunderstood.

—At last the University of Toronto has a Classical Professor, though up to this time no appointment to the Presidency has been announced. Mr. Hutton brings to the Classical Chair high credentials in the shape of Oxford honours, and no doubt he will be cordially received. No objection was raised, we believe, against the appointment of a Professor from Oxford, provided Canadian claims were fairly and respectfully considered. The objection expressed was to the election of the youngest Professor, with an exceptional title and salary, over the heads of all the rest, merely because his subject was classics; and this is about the only point connected with the University and public education which is not treated in the elaborate State paper put forth in vindication of his conduct by the Minister of Education. The "cultured youth of Canada," whose "know-nothing yell" brought down upon them the censure of Mr. Gordon Brown, may be comforted by observing that their censor himself thinks it not indecent or unjust to hold up to odium as "a carpet bagger" an Englishman settled in this country, who, so far as we are aware, has shown no special tendency to selfish encroachment. It is written, if we mistake not, in our annals that Mr. Gordon Brown himself was a native of Scotland, who migrated first to the United States, and afterwards to Canada. Some day the Reform leaders will begin to moralize on the character of this "righteous and beneficent" organ of theirs, and to consider the aspect under which it presents their cause and its probable effect in attracting or repelling generous and really Liberal minds.

—It seems that on the question of Prohibitive Legislation it is necessary once more to mark our position. We respect the promoters of the movement and their object: if they fancy that our respect is feigned, let them in justice ask themselves what conceivable motive we can have for feigning it. But we refuse, in the first place, to subscribe, under any threat of anathema, to what appears to us to be a false morality.

When a man, say a French or Spanish peasant, drinks wine with his meal, provided he does not drink enough to affect his head, we cannot call him intemperate; the name seems to us more applicable to one who overloads his stomach, clouds his brain, and sours his temper with a heavy dinner, though he may boast of drinking nothing but water. As soon as medical science distinctly pronounces wine or any other kind of liquor to be bad for us, the indulgence will become immoral, because in what concerns health, the dictate of medical science is the dictate of morality. We apprehend, however, that medical science would bear us out in saying that human diet is a complex thing; that even supposing a change to be desirable, there might be danger in abruptly enforcing it on a whole community; and that the sudden suppression of the liquor trade would be apt to be followed by a great increase of the trade in opium. So much for the ethical part of the matter. With regard to the question of prohibitive legislation, we hold it to be a valuable principle that, in a free country, people, if they want to alter the habits of their neighbours, shall do it by argument or example, and not by force. Still, if there is a real necessity—if the evil is truly formidable and transcends all voluntary agencies of reform—we are as ready as any one can be for prohibitive legislation. But then we want the legislation to be thoroughgoing, effectual, and without respect of class or person. Show that you have the courage of your opinions; forbid liquor of any kind to be made or imported: only in that way can you really prevent it from being drunk. By harassing the retail trade, you merely throw it into disreputable hands and beget secret drinking, low dens, and contrabandism. Such is our conviction, founded on what we have seen and heard both in this country and in the United States. A tour of enquiry round the outskirts of Toronto would show, we believe, that the apprehension is not utterly baseless. By this policy of forbidding liquor to be openly sold and drunk, while we allow it to be made, and the State actually draws a revenue from it, the object is not gained, and at the same time society is filled with suspicion, scandal, and inquisi-

torial denunciation. The same class of people that in the days of Cotton Mather would have been busy in witch-finding, are now busy in detecting cases of intemperance. A "religious" paper which persists in forcing itself on our notice, scatters imputations of beastly excess and fancies that it is displaying its superior Christianity; while in another article, on the same subject, it betrays a personal malignity which would disgust any decent heathen. Why cannot the editor address himself to topics really theological, such as that of "Infant Damnation," which we see mooted at the same time in his columns, and settle the question which appears to agitate the minds of his correspondents, whether "babies a span long" are liable to be sent to a place where they will be forever deprived of the bliss of the editor's society? We do not allude to the *Christian Guardian*, nor is it the *Christian Guardian* the language of which forces on us the reflection that Christianity must have deep roots indeed if it can withstand the efforts of a certain portion of the religious press. Yet we think that even the *Christian Guardian* might make more charitable allowance for honest difference of opinion. There was a Guest at the Marriage Supper in Cana who must have deemed charity of more value than total abstinence from wine. It is not likely, at least, that He would have wrought a miracle to supply people with "poison" or have bid His disciples drink "poison" forever in remembrance of Him.

It seems not impossible, from the present tendency of thought, that this and other questions of human diet, may, like less material questions, receive a relative and historical, instead of an absolute and quasi-theological, treatment. There are people who want all the world at once to give up animal food, which they call "corpses," as the Prohibitionists call wine "poison." The world will hardly consent. Yet there seems to be some reason for believing in progressive, though not in sudden vegetarianism. In Homer we find the heroes eating enormous masses of flesh, cooked in the rudest way, with apparently no vegetables and little bread; not only so, but they and their poet revel in the

work of the shambles, as a poet of our day would in that of harvest, or (if he were not a Prohibitionist) of vintage. In more civilized times the proportion of vegetable food increases; and the taste grows more fastidious, seeking the refinements and disguises of French cookery; while the slaughter house, the butcher's shop, and the preliminary operations of the kitchen, are repulsive always, and in poetry would be shocking. The digestion of a primitive hunter is not retained by man in his sedentary state. Moreover, much more farinaceous than animal food can be raised on a given area, which may become a consideration as the world grows crowded. Is there any power or faculty of the human frame or brain, to the maintenance of which meat is alsolutely essential? The British labourer gets scarcely any meat, yet of all men, he does the hardest day's work. Sir Gilbert Eliot, the heroic defender of Gibraltar, was a vegetarian: Thomas Aquinas died under fifty, having accomplished perhaps the most prodigious of all the dry works of the intellect, and as a Saint, he is sure to have kept the rule of his Order, which forbade meat; while Shelley, on the other hand, the most imaginative of poets, was a vegetarian like Aquinas. Unless there be something abnormal in these instances, it would appear that meat is not indispensable; in which case, it seems possible that the tendencies we have mentioned may in time completely prevail, and that to Vegetarianism may belong the future.

—A Toronto Minister has been cashiered by his congregation for proved incontinence; but he finds another congregation of enthusiastic followers ready to accept him as their spiritual guide. The moral world stands aghast, and the phenomenon undoubtedly is noteworthy; yet, perhaps, Handfordism does not come from the pit of Tophet. In the first place, men, young men especially, are inclined, from chivalrous feeling, to rally round any man who is being run down, even though he may be in the wrong. In the second place, people feel that in

these eager investigations of clerical scandals there is a good deal of prurient hypocrisy and dirty sensation-mongering at which they wish to express their disgust without knowing precisely the best way of expressing it. In the third place there is an admiration of intellectual power, or the semblance of it, which blinds the worshipper to the moral guilt of his idol, as, to take an illustration from a higher sphere, Bacon-worshippers blind themselves, in the face of overwhelming evidence, to the moral guilt of Bacon. After making these deductions, however, there does remain a residuum of ethical heterodoxy in a defiant attitude of which it concerns our spiritual pastors and masters to take note. Morality has hitherto been bound up with religion, and the great moral systems, pagan as well as Christian, have presented themselves in a religious form. The decay of religious belief is therefore sure to be attended with a disturbance of moral principle; and if our religion is destined to be in any measure reconstructed, so probably are our ethics. No person of sense has said more than this, and this daily occurrences attest. It would not be surprising if, among other modifications, a change were destined to take place in our estimation of the relative turpitude of crimes of lust and crimes of malice. Perhaps there may be something in the Handford case premonitory of that change.

—In the bye-elections for West Toronto and other places, the one issue, of a public kind, has been the interminable N.P. The discussion is still without form and void. Opposition leaders do not tell us what they would have done to fill the deficit which they bequeathed, and until they have told us, it is impossible to say whether their policy would have been better than that of the present Government. That the increase of taxation is, in itself, an evil, and nothing but an evil, we at least most cordially concede to them: but unluckily it was inevitable, though it might not have been so, had they taken the course which we should have thought their principles prescribed, and discarded, instead of adopting and continuing, the

system of Imperialist expenditure generally, and particularly the construction of political railways. They make elaborate speeches in favour of Free Trade and against Protection. No doubt the New Tariff has been represented as Protectionist by its ardent supporters, and the Government to catch Protectionist votes, has encouraged the idea. As a matter of fact, however, the only new duty which can justly be called Protectionist, as having been imposed, not for the purpose of revenue, but for that of enforcing the consumption of a home product, is the Coal duty, which will not stand. All the rest, the Opposition, if it came into power to-morrow, would have to retain, or to replace by other taxes which would equally interfere with freedom of trade. Economy and retrenchment, cheaper government, and renunciation of all public works not commercially profitable, are the financial policy which the country, justly alarmed at the growth of its liabilities, desires, and which "Reformers" ought to promise it. But instead of this, the leading "Reform" organ advocates, with vituperative energy, the construction of political railways through the rocky wilds of British Columbia, defends the Kingston Military College, and tries in these very elections to raise a cry against a candidate for wishing, as it alleges, to diminish the preposterous cost of Provincial Government. As to the mere adjustment of the new taxes, which is the only thing really open to debate, there may be room for difference of opinion, though, as we have said before, the best and most impartial judgment to which we happen to have access, is favourable to the tariff. But we may be very certain that this is quite secondary in comparison with the great causes, such as the harvests and the state of the lumber trade, which affect, for better or worse, the commercial prosperity of the country.

—General Hancock's letter of acceptance is dignified and soldier-like; but it says little more than "Great is the American Constitution." In the mouth of a Democrat, however,

"Great is the American Constitution" has a special signification: it means that the South is not to be bound to keep the national election laws. It means generally that the South is to be allowed to do as it thinks fit, Constitutional Amendments and principles vindicated by the Civil War, notwithstanding. It means this practically in the mouth of Mr. Bayard as well as in that of anyone else. General Hancock as President will be a a most respectable cocked hat upon a pole under which the South will rule: it will rule as it ruled in former days, because, though a minority, it is compact, united in interest, highly political and because it thoroughly knows its own mind. It rules in the present Congress, and by its strength of will forces its Northern allies to do things which they dislike and know to be impolitic. There are some, and they not wild alarmists, who expect, as the consequence of a Democratic victory, a recognition of the part played by the South in the Civil War as equally patriotic with that played by the North, payment of the Confederate debt, and pensions for Southern soldiers. This will hardly be accomplished without a second Civil War. But we look forward to some attempt to redress the political balance in favour of the South. The annexation of Mexico, should the Southern policy take that direction, would bring a fearful reinforcement to the elements of barbarism, political villainy, corruption, and disunion. Many right-minded citizens are likely to vote for Hancock in the belief that his election will be a final Act of Oblivion. If the South had greatly changed its character and become unaggressive, that might be so; but unluckily the South has not greatly changed its character, nor has it become unaggressive. So much a glimpse into the Halls of Congress will suffice to prove. On the other hand, that section of the Republican party which, under Grant, governed the South through carpet-baggers backed by bayonets, has decisively succumbed to the better section; and there is no reason for fearing that General Garfield will do anything more than uphold the law. If the law is not to be upheld the Union is dissolved.

The Democrats are very confident, and the omens during the month following the nomination were decidedly in their favour, But the Republican party was undergoing extensive repair after the shattering collision between its two elements at Chicago. It may be surmised that secret and not very edifying negotiations were being carried on with the "Bosses" of New York and Pennsylvania, Conkling and Don Cameron, who were very sulky over the rejection of Grant, and, notwithstanding their doctrines about the divine right of party, would very likely have cut Garfield's throat in the dark had they remained unappeased. They have probably been confirmed in their respective Boss-ships, with the patronage annexed. The Garfield section of the party is comparatively pure and reforming, but it cannot escape the necessities of the party system. It yields to these necessities again in evading the question of Civil Service reform, which, whatever flattering tales hope or Hayes may tell, will never be taken up in good faith by either of the two factions, both of which are essentially dependent on the active services of place-hunters. The campaign has now opened and apparently with great enthusiasm on the Republican side. That the party has been in power long enough, and that there ought to be a change, is a feeling which will tell with many, though the truth is that there could hardly be a greater change than from Grant to Garfield. On the other hand the country is prosperous, and commerce may be inclined to let well alone. Whichever way the battle may go, it is to be hoped that the result will be decisive. The prospect of a disputed election hangs over the Republic like a thunder cloud.

Even without the additional evil of a disputed election, these contests for the Presidency are enough to tear a nation to pieces, and they will do it some day if the system is not changed. The passions which they kindle are always increasing in violence, and each contest adds to the number of active spirits who leave honest trades for place-hunting, faction and intrigue, so that the community is continually falling more under the sway of its worst members. Our contests for the Prime Ministership,

which is our Presidency, do the same mischief here, though they are less regular in their recurrence. Such a device of devils was never dreamed of by the Fathers of the Republic, who evidently had no idea of organized party, and intended the President to be really elected, not by the popular vote, but by Presidential electors. That their sagacity was strangely at fault does not make their design less certain. It would be something if the election could be transferred from the people at large to Congress; but the proposer of such a change would be stoned to death.

—Good citizens of the United States have work enough for their political energies without flying at each other's throats. The days of self complacent perfection and boundless hope are over; those of trial and of misgiving as to the future have come. From the joyous and thoughtless infancy in which serious statesmanship was needless and finance was only spending the nation has passed to the cares and difficulties of maturity. The author of the work on "Certain Dangerous Tendencies in American Life" is rather a Jeremiah. He does not sufficiently note the evidences of fundamental soundness still presented by the society in which he lives—the general morality and intelligence of the people, the respect for law, the diffusion of property, the prosperous state of commerce, the honesty and confidence of which it is the proof, the good administration of railways and of the ordinary machinery of trade, the flourishing condition of the finances, and the rapid reduction of the debt, which would be impossible if the Treasury and the management of the revenue were not, on the whole, in faithful hands. But he finds abundant justification for his cry of warning in the decay of religious belief and of the moral forces with it, in the dangerous chimeras which prevail in close connection with secularism among the artisans, in the corruption of politics national and municipal, in the fearful legacy of reckless extravagance and of unscrupulous covetousness bequeathed by the paper-money pestilence of the Civil War. Undoubtedly the Repub-

lic has before her trying times; and such Democrats as Mr. Bayard, instead of fighting against Republicans like General Garfield, ought to be fighting with them against the powers of evil, to the malignant aid of which, while these political contests last, really patriotic men on both sides are compelled to appeal.

—Miss M. A. Hardaker, in the last *North American Review*, boldly avowed, in the face of the Woman's Rights Sisterhood, her conviction that woman is not the equal of man in intellectual power, and had better not attempt to compete with him in the arena of political ambition. This will, of course, scandalize the theorists who, in defiance of apparently substantial facts, extending even to the cases of pursuits specially female, such as music, contend that woman is "a female man," and would show herself to be one, if she were freely admitted to the male career. We do not know why it should scandalize any one else. Why should intellectual power be taken as the criterion of excellence rather than beauty of character and intensity of affection? Nothing, we should say, more clearly belongs to the Finite than human intellect, while beauty of character and intensity of affection are akin, if anything is, to the Divine. Why, again, is it to be assumed that the family is a sphere of action much less important than the State? We should say it was the more important of the two, provided only that it can be allowed to subsist on something like its present footing, though the case will be altered if marriage is reduced to a commercial "copartnership," the children of which, we presume, are no more to be allowed to feel reverence for their parents than the wife is to be allowed to feel respect for her husband. If the two sexes are to be competitors, experiment will decide which is the superior in strength and combative power. So long as they are complements of each other, there can be no question about superiority or inferiority, nor, in a marriage worthy of the name, do such thoughts ever arise on either side.

Miss Hardaker thinks that women have a right to the suffrage, but that they had better not assert it. We cannot admit that members of a community have a right to anything which it is better for the community that they should not have. If the life of a woman in the bosom of the family is unfavourable, as it appears to be, to the formation of political character, so that political power vested in her hands would produce mis-government, to concede Female Suffrage would be to do a wrong to both sexes. A tremendous wrong it would be. Americans seem inclined to treat this question with dangerous levity. They appear to think that if the "ladies" have a fancy for political power it would be a harmless piece of gallantry to give it to them. The truth is that it would be the most radical and momentous of all changes. Nobody, we suppose, will pretend to deny that, at present, there is a profound difference between the male and the female character; there would be a difference equally profound between male and female government. In England, where there is a property qualification for the suffrage, it is only proposed to give the vote to widows and spinsters owning property; but in the United States, where the suffrage is personal, the female voters would be equal in number to the male, if they would not be the majority. Let people figure to themselves the Republic in the midst of the Civil War, swayed by the emotions of the women. What would be the ultimate result it is difficult to foresee, because we cannot tell beforehand to what extent the women would be practically controlled in the exercise of the suffrage by the men. But the natural tendencies of women are to personal rather than to constitutional government, and if their inclinations were allowed free course, it is probable that personal government, formal or informal, would be the result and that republican institutions would virtually cease to exist.

For what object is it that we are to run this risk and at the same time to introduce political division into the family, and expose female character, on which the happiness of home de-

pends, to the demagogism and all the questionable influences of public life? Are women an oppressed class? They are not a class at all; they are a sex, and while Christian marriage continues to exist, they will be, "one flesh" with their husbands, who it cannot be doubted have legislated, as they have laboured and fought, for their wives and children, as well as for themselves. The advocates of female suffrage are always pointing to cases of wife-beating. There are laws already against wife-beating, and nobody would hesitate to make them more severe, if increased severity would check the evil; but it is notorious that excessive penalties fail. Women are often guilty of cruelty to children, as well as men to women, and the legislator must deal wisely, not passionately, with all these offences alike. These brutalities, though they make our hearts sick, are the consequences not of anything wrong either in conjugal or parental relations, but of the degradation which prevails in certain strata of society, and which extends to the women as well as to the men. The legislative equalization of wages, so that women shall always receive the same as men, though their labour may be worth less, is another fancy which seems to float before the minds of some people, but we need hardly say that it is a chimera. Female singers, actresses, authoresses, painters, milliners, are not paid less than men. As to general equality before the law, the fact is not that it is difficult for a woman to get justice, but that it is by no means easy to get justice against a woman. It is comparatively rare to see extreme penalties inflicted on female crime.

If the women were to pass extravagant laws in their own favour, the men would refuse to execute the laws, the women would be unable to execute them for themselves, and anarchy, or rather the overturn of female authority, would ensue. Government, even in the most civilized communities, rests at bottom upon force, which in the last resort compels obedience to the law; and force resides in the men. This is a rude but solid fact, of which those who fancy that they can place political power in the hands of the women seem never to be distinctly aware.

The notion that politics would be softened, refined, and purified by bringing women and the family into them involves a palpable fallacy. Women have remained free from political vices because they have been kept out of political life. A series of political letters by a woman appeared some time ago in a great New York journal: they at least equalled in scurrilous violence the worst productions of male pens, and their special and avowed object was to uphold favouritism and the spoils system against reform. Such, in this case, was the Angel in Politics, and such, we suspect, she would very often be.

Justice must be done. Man would certainly be the loser if woman instead of being his partner were to become his competitor, if instead of comforting him she were to confront him in the struggle of life. But if woman thinks she would be the gainer, she must be allowed to try. She must only remember that she cannot take both lines, or combine the advantages of both. The relation between the sexes has hitherto been one of mutual privilege: if it is henceforth to be one of equality and rivalry, privilege on both sides will cease. It will cease for the whole sex, though only a few women may be successful in public or professional life. We doubt whether the women who lead the movement have looked this consequence in the face. Habit holds and would for some time hold its own: the chivalrous feelings of men towards women are not to be extinguished in a moment; but not many years would pass before the Woman's Right ladies would find that if they chose to be men, men they would have to be, and either hold their own or go to the wall. The gentler sex would, to use Burke's phrase, be put out of the protection and guardianship of the other—as momentous a revolution as it is possible to conceive.

The Women's Right movement does not seem to have been spontaneous, or to have had its origin in any sense of wrong prevailing among the sex at large. It has apparently been worked up mainly by a few ladies who wish to take part in public life. But its prime author was Mr. Mill, who, with all his ability and excellences, was not on this subject a trustworthy

guide. We learn from his autobiography that he formed relations with another man's wife, which, though they were pure and we desire to speak of them with all tenderness, could not fail to place him at a fallacious point of view. His work on "The Subjection of Women" is the manual of the crusade; and in that book there are passages about the tyranny of the husband and the worse than slavery of the wife, which, as applied to Christian marriage in England, may be said to border on hallucination, and which, had they taken effect upon the imagination of women, must have marred the happiness of many an English home. The natural inference from them would be, that there ought to be an almost unqualified liberty of divorce, which must, of course, be extended to husbands as well as to wives, and which, when extended to husbands, would hardly improve the condition of women; for marriage is especially a restraint on the wandering passions of the man. Some of Mr. Mill's disciples in England have been and are pushing on legislation with regard to the relations of married people, based apparently on the belief that too much injustice cannot be done to such an ogre as a husband, and that the natural enemy of a woman's interests is the man on whose breast she lays her head. It is not unlikely that by making marriage onerous and odious to men, they may succeed in producing, among classes little under the influence of refined sentiment, a great increase of concubinage, for which they will receive but scanty thanks from the women of the future.

—It is curious that the same people who assert for women an equality of intellectual force with men, and claim for them on that ground a share in political government, should propose to legislate about Seduction on the assumption that, in the matters most nearly affecting her personally, a woman is totally devoid of will and of the power of self-control. Against violence the law is stringent already; but where violence is not used, a woman is the guardian of her own honour, and to affirm by legislation that she is not, but that the guilt of her

consent rests wholly on her partner in the offence, would be to remove the bulwark of her virtue and to make the law practically an accomplice in seduction. Suppose the man does promise marriage in order to compass his end, the woman knows very well that she ought to wait for the fulfilment of his promise. If the chief blame usually rests on the man, whose passions are the strongest, the woman can never be blameless, and sometimes she is the more sinning of the two. Even Mrs. Wetmore must have been self-betrayed. After all, the majority of the women who fall owe their ruin to the wickedness of their own sex. As we write comes the intelligence that a pair of procuresses have been caught on board a steamboat with two girls, one of twelve, the other eleven years old, in their fiendish clutch. By passing a law treating the conduct of the man, and of the man alone, as criminal, an opportunity would be afforded to those ladies of combining the trade of the blackmailer with that of the procuress. So Lord Angelo, amidst the transports of his virtuous zeal, had better pause a moment to reflect on the probable consequences of his measures. The mighty passion which, under happy circumstances, leads a man joyously to take upon him the heavy burden of maintaining a wife and family, exists too often in excess or where, through the imperfections of our social system, there is no possibility of marriage; and the fire which is a good servant is, in this case too, a bad master. Such is the broad fact with which the practical legislator or social reformer has to deal, and he must deal with it as it is: legislation built on high-flown sentiment always comes to the ground. Whatever facilitates marriage prevents impurity, and whatever adds to the prosperity of the people facilitates marriage. Penal laws stamped with extravagance and injustice will merely enlist the sympathies of the community on the side of the offender. Preachers, however, when they are compelled to address young men on this subject might do well by giving them less of mysticism and more of humanity. Spiritual purity is a motive which operates chiefly with the spiritual and pure. But those who

can neither be called spiritual nor pure, those in whom the animal propensities are unusually strong, are not necessarily heartless; and with any one who is not heartless no argument can be imagined so effectual as a faithful picture of the unspeakable degradation and misery to which the poor victim of his self-indulgence is consigned.

—The ethical and social difficulties of the Transition continue to present themselves, notably in regard to the relations between the sexes. A Presbyterian Assembly has been dealing with a knotty case. A woman, having, as it is stated, a right to be divorced, on account of adultery and desertion, but finding a legal divorce not practically attainable in Canada, solved the difficulty by taking a ticket for Illinois, and going through the form of divorce there; after which she deemed herself free to marry again. We cannot help agreeing with those who would treat the Illinois divorce as morally and legally null. Bigamy would be legalized in Utah. The lady ought to have gone to the Canadian House of Lords. Said Judge Maule, of witty memory, to a prisoner in England, a poor man, who had been convicted before him of bigamy, for marrying again under similar circumstances—"Prisoner, you must understand that in this country there is not one law for the rich and another for the poor. Your proper course was, when your wife went off with another man, to institute proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Court. If successful there, you should have proceeded to bring a private Bill into the House of Lords. This would, probably, have cost you a thousand pounds, and you never in your life possessed a thousand pence. Therefore, the sentence of the court upon you is, that you be imprisoned for three years." Deprived of the Divorce cases, the Senate would feel that the only thread which binds it to life was severed. Nevertheless, a rational Divorce law, and a proper Divorce Court, Canada ought to have, at least, if any of her statesmen can spare time from the party struggle to give their thoughts to a grave question of domestic morality.

—Dean Stanley has learned that in this perverse world the Peacemakers are not always blessed. His attempt to reconcile England with the Bonapartes by erecting a Bonaparte monument in Westminster Abbey, has brought a hailstorm about his ears: his attempt to reconcile the American Republic with the Old Country, by suggesting an American monument to André, has revived the André controversy. Few questions can be more unsavoury or less capable of satisfactory solution. If André was a spy, his case fell under the law which condemns spies to be hanged and which all military men apparently deem a necessity of war. On that supposition we should only have to say that there is nothing disgraceful in being a spy; that King Alfred went as a spy into the Danish camp; that you may as well inspect an enemy's position in this way as through a telescope; that he who thus braves danger by himself, instead of doing anything particularly mean, is a greater hero than he who braves danger as one of a multitude. But with us the question has been, and still is, whether André really was a spy. He did not enter the American lines for the purpose of privily inspecting them, but for the purpose of holding a conference with the commander, by whose invitation he came. This, at all events, belongs to a different class of acts, and for our part, though we see clearly enough that the Americans would have been warranted in hanging Arnold if they had caught him, we have never been able to see quite so clearly that they were warranted in hanging André. To take advantage of overtures made by the malcontent officers or troops of the enemy is surely fair play. Franklin was party to a scheme for tampering with the fidelity of the Hessians. Concealment is a necessary feature of any such enterprise, and can be no crime in itself, apart from the object of the person who resorts to it. It is fair, however, to say that when the malcontents in Soult's army, during the campaign in Portugal, opened communications with the Duke of Wellington, it was with great reluctance that a British Colonel consented to act as negotiator, and that when his mission took him within the French lines, he scrupulously

retained his uniform. Nor have we the slightest doubt that the Royal commander would have hanged an American André. All these questions are perplexed by the peculiar character of civil war, which confuses the relations of the belligerents: there is necessarily a period in which the belligerency of the rebels is but half recognised by the army of the Government; and to the end there are political objects on both sides and justifications for a mixture of political with military measures which have no counterpart in ordinary wars. André gave his life for the power which he served, and at the hands of that power he deserved a monument: it is not likely he will receive one at the hands of the nation which he nearly overthrew.

—English politics are entering on a phase profoundly interesting to the political observer. The majority by which the Lords rejected the Compensation Bill was so large as to place out of the question any resort to the constitutional method of restoring "harmony" between the branches of the Legislature by appealing to the country and then creating new peers. It was not the vote of a party, but of a landed aristocracy resolved that whatever else is to be meddled with, there shall be no meddling with the land. To large political concessions the order has consented, under the advice of sagacious and trusted leaders; but to touch the land and territorial privilege is to touch its life. The rejection of the Compensation Bill will, in all probability, prove the first gun of a long-deferred battle. Little as the Lords think it, the delay has been partly due to certain aristocratic sympathies which linger in the mind of Mr. Gladstone, who has always remained personally on the best of terms with the Duke of Argyll, Lord Granville, and the other patrician leaders of his party. In his last administration, the Lords threw down the gauntlet to him by rejecting his Army Reform Bill, and he might have taken it up with advantage; but he declined the combat, and preferred to surmount the obstacle by making a questionable use of the prerogative of the Crown.

Now the inevitable has arrived: the Liberal Associations throughout the country have answered the rejection of the Compensation Bill by a demand for the reform of the House of Lords; and they cannot recede from that demand, or again adjourn the conflict without permitting hereditary and territorial aristocracy to resume its effective veto on progress, at least with regard to questions in which it conceives its own interest to be vitally concerned. The final result can hardly be doubtful: the House of Lords is the last survivor of the European group: the social conditions on which it was founded have nearly ceased to exist, and the hour of its doom has already been tolled from a hundred towers. The age of Democracy has come; though Democracy itself, as we now behold it, may be merely the vast fermentation of political and social elements preparatory to the birth of a more impartial and more rational Authority. That six hundred families should long be permitted to keep one of the two co-ordinate branches of the Legislature to themselves in a country full of political life and activity may be safely pronounced impossible; especially as England, however Conservative, is being daily drawn more within the sweep of the European tide. It is true that the British aristocracy has, of all aristocracies, shown the greatest power of accommodating itself to necessary change: but then the change, as we have said, has been political, not economical or social, and it has spared the hereditary principle. When the hereditary principle was touched by Lord Palmerston's proposal to use the Royal prerogative of creating, *ad libitum*, Life Peers, the House of Lords showed itself ready to rush into what, had Lord Palmerston been resolute and a real enemy, would have been a very perilous conflict. During the most critical period of its history, that which followed the Reform Bill of 1832, the Lords happened to be under the guidance of one who might be truly called a heaven-sent leader. Peel, though the faithful guardian of the interests of aristocracy, in which as a Conservative he believed, was not himself an aristocrat, nor did he share the passions of the order whose game he was set to play. He

was himself a scion of commerce, not without a strong popular fibre: he touched on different sides of his mind and character every considerable section of the nation; he assured to it, as a whole, prosperity by his financial genius, and he knew how to satisfy its desire of progress, by combining with organic conservatism administrative reform. With the aid of the Duke of Wellington, who took a strategical view of the situation, he had succeeded in persuading the Peers, while they exercised their social influence, to avoid political conflict with the people, and to let their battle be fought in the House of Commons. But after him, and on the ruins of his power and system, appeared a more dazzling genius, the inventor of an Empress of India, the author of the Anglo-Turkish Treaty, the purchaser of the Suez Canal and Cyprus, the conqueror of Afghanistan, who assured the Lords, as well as the Court, that by turning the proletariat against the middle class, and by exciting the military pride of the nation, they might change the political current, and enter again into possession of real power. The Lords gave ear to the enchanter, and the result is that they have quickened the slow march of Fate. For, we repeat, the Liberal party cannot now draw back without allowing a group of privileged families to exercise a political veto on the legislation of the future.

—Still, the drama may be long in unfolding itself. The advanced Liberal party is likely soon to be left without a leader. Mr. Gladstone's constitution is powerful, but he is over seventy, and he does not know how to take rest. Moreover, the ceaseless abuse, though it may not wound him, must wear him: ceaseless abuse wears, if it does not wound, all but those who are morally case-hardened, which a man of cultivated sensibility never is. It will be surprising if the recent breakdown, for such evidently was the nature of the illness, does not prove premonitory of a retirement from public life. Who then is to take the reins? Not only has Mr. Gladstone no peer, nor anything like a peer, among the advanced Liberals

in genius, or in power of impressing the minds of the masses: but the advantages of his position are unique. His religious character attaches to him a great body of devout men, both High Churchmen and Non-conformists, who would not follow an Agnostic; while his culture and his social connections have enabled him to retain a hold on auxiliaries with whom the party can hardly dispense at present, though it will have to dispense with them in the future. The three Radicals in the government are Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, and Professor Fawcett, who have respectively their merits, but who would hardly, if united, make a chief. Before Mr. Gladstone's retirement, it is not unlikely that there may follow an interlude of coalition government, for which the Whig portion of the present cabinet is evidently ready. The Whigs could not act under Lord Beaconsfield: their traditional policy is unlike his, though their paramount aim may not be very different, and he has always affected to hate them: but Lord Beaconsfield cannot remain much longer on the scene. The Radical, and not only the Radical but the Republican, party in England is stronger than is commonly supposed. Political intercourse with the Continent, and sympathetic interest in the revolution there have told, especially on the artisans. Mr. Gladstone is highly impressible; he is a sensitive index of opinion; and the Radical tendencies of his later years mark the action of a great force which has carried him away from his old social moorings. But a great force may exist for some time without assuming an organic form, or finding a leader who can bring it to bear.

—Were we not right in saying that, if respect were had to party interest alone, the Liberal party in England had better have remained a little longer out of power? Coming in when they did, they inherited not only the Eastern complications but a legacy of almost inevitable calamity in Afghanistan. Nothing can be more certain than that the disaster of Candahar, like the disaster of Cabul, is a consequence of the disregard by the late Gov-

ernment of the experience of 1840 and of the advice of all the greatest and wisest of Anglo-Indian warriors and statesmen, including the Duke of Wellington, Lord Hardinge, and Lord Lawrence, who unlike the restless clique in the councils of Calcutta which has always been bent on the conquest of Afghanistan, earnestly recommended the preservation of the neutral zone. But the blame of General Burrows's defeat is of course cast by the Opposition on the new Government. The Jingoes in India ascribe it, not to their own folly in acting against the strongest warnings, but to English humanity which has prevented them from shedding blood enough and sufficiently outraging the rights of man. The death of Major Cavagnari, they say, ought to have been avenged. It was avenged by the execution of eighty men, without sufficient evidence of their guilt, as well as by the slaughter of undisciplined mobs in what were styled battles, and the burning of villages, from which the aged, the women, and the children must have been driven out, probably to perish on the hillside. But the Jingoes would have made Afghanistan an Aceldama, as they would have made India itself at the time of the mutiny, had their diabolical frenzy not been crushed and the honour of England saved by him whom their hatred branded as "Clemency Canning." They are now beginning to rebel against the restraining tutelage of the Home Government, saying that if the Empire is to be upheld, they must be left free to work their sanguinary will upon the natives; and it is not unlikely that the Mother Country herself will have a taste of their violence of temper. Evidently the policy of Peel's disciple now is that of his master in 1841: he means, after sufficiently asserting the superiority of England, to retire from Afghanistan. No bad consequence followed on the former occasion: nor is it likely that any will follow now. That the blow received by British prestige will lead to a rising in India is in the last degree unlikely. No doubt the natives, especially the Mahometans, whom English conquest thrust from the throne, are ill-affected to the alien rule and would shake it off if they could: but they have long been disarmed; such of them as had a mili-

tary character, the people of Mysore for instance, have entirely lost it and become like a flock of sheep; they are without leaders and without union, as well as destitute of weapons and of all the material of war. Native princes, especially the two great Mahratta powers, have considerable armies; but they are not likely to stir unless they are disquieted by Jingo threats. Not in that direction but in the direction of finance the real peril of the Indian Empire lies. The worst part of the defeat near Candahar, perhaps, is the break-down of the Sepoy. The army which mutinied was high-caste: after that catastrophe it was thought politic to recruit from the low castes, and we have heard British officers speak with the utmost dissatisfaction of the results. Had the Sepoys, instead of being paraded about the Mediterranean, been actually opposed to European troops in a Russian war, there would probably have been a headlong rout, with which the British regiments might have been swept along. The world will note this and will never again be scared by the apparition of an Indian army in the West.

—Everything confirms our belief that Ireland has found in Mr. Parnell, not a leader but an agitator, one of that fatal race whom she has been following at intervals for the last half century, and whose main object it is not to attain any definite measure of reform or improvement, but to keep alive the excitement by which they live. Mr. Parnell seems to hate most those who, by doing justice, would allay the agitation. What he would do himself, we may be perfectly sure he does not know; what he wants is, that this storm should continue to rage and he to ride on it. It rages with a vengeance; agrarian murder is stalking abroad, and Fenianism is landing arms and drilling by night. We have avowed before that we can fully enter into an Irishman's desire of independence for his country; in truth we should think it wonderful if an Irishman could read a work like Mr. Froude's, breathing the rampant immorality and the maddening insolence of conquest, without feel-

ing a burning desire to break the yoke. Strafford, when charged with arbitrary government in Ireland, pleaded that the Irish were a conquered nation. "They were a conquered nation!" retorted Pym. "There cannot be a word more pregnant and fruitful in treason than that word is. There are few nations in the world that have not been conquered, and no doubt but the conqueror may give what law he pleases to those that are conquered; but, if the succeeding facts and agreements do not limit and restrain that right, what people can be secure? England hath been conquered, and Wales hath been conquered; and by this reason will be in little better care than Ireland. If the king, by the right of a conqueror, gives laws to his people, shall not the people, by the same reason, be restored to the right of the conquered, to recover their liberty if they can." What is the greatness of the Empire to an Irishman, if his country is to be its washpot? Had Tyrone, had Phelim O'Neil, had even Wolfe Tone succeeded, he might have ranked with Tell or Wallace; as, if England had been the smaller and weaker country, would an Englishman who had rescued her from Irish domination. But the time is past. A Scotch and English population, large in number and strong out of proportion to its number, occupies the North of Ireland, and forms throughout the island a wealthy and powerful class. The native language is all but extinct. A Liberal policy has brought the wealthy laity, with few exceptions, and a large portion of the priesthood, to the side of the Union, while the priests as a body, and especially the hierarchy, are opposed to Fenianism. The Irish Channel is still an important fact; but fast boats and trains have made it far less important now than it was when the Lord Lieutenant's travelling carriage had to be taken to pieces and carried over Penmaermaur, and when from Dublin to Holyhead was a voyage. The Irish colonies in England are as yet unassimilated, but assimilation must take place, and when it does, it will amount to a fusion of the races. Even O'Connell, though he formally kept up the Repeal agitation, and drew his rent as Liberator, evidently felt that the movement was hopeless, and in truth a

sham. Rebellion would be madness. What could a crowd of peasants, armed with old Enfields, and taught their facings in small parties by night, do against discipline, rifled artillery, and the Martini-Henry? The Irish have no partisans in Europe. As Catholics, they have been liegemen of the European Reaction, and they had the misfortune to bear arms against the independence of Italy. They have no partisans in America but their own kinsmen: for following their priests into the Democratic party they banded themselves with slavery against the Union, and earned the lasting hatred of Unionists by their insurrection against the Draft at New York. If England had another enemy on her hands, a rising in Ireland might be dangerous; but even in that case the result would probably be what it was before; Ireland would be used by her foreign ally and then left to British vengeance. "The Irish have made a diversion," said Bonaparte to the Directory, "what more do you want of them?" The interest of Ireland seems to dictate hearty co-operation with that party in the Imperial Parliament which has shown itself willing to do justice: an instalment may be accepted without prejudice to further demands; but it is not the interest of Ireland that governs Mr. Parnell's actions. If, after disgusting every body, including the more reasonable Home Rulers, he brings the Tories back to power, they will crush him and his followers like an eggshell.

—The change in the English Libel law, exempting journals from prosecution for faithful reports of public meetings, has given birth to some discussion. It is alleged that there is a possibility of abuse; that the public meeting may not be worthy of the name, and that factitious importance may be given by the report to what would otherwise be mere hole-and-corner slander. Still this change seems just. To relax any real safeguard of personal reputation, which of all rights is most precious to a generous spirit, no journalist worthy of his calling would desire. An honourable profession cannot wish to har

bour under its immunities caitiffs and cowards, of whom the personal libeller is about the vilest. As it is, the protection for character is scanty enough. In a libel suit, as it is at present conducted, instead of the aggressor being tried for the specific offence, the person aggrieved is tried upon his whole life. The real issue is smothered by the sinister skill of counsel in matters entirely foreign to it. Judges wish to restrain the iniquity, but are not able. A man against whom, on political or other grounds, any prejudice exists, or can be created, has no chance of justice, and will rather let his character take its chance than stake it on the verdict of a totally untrustworthy tribunal. A common jury, moreover, is hardly competent to pronounce on a moral and sentimental wrong. On the other hand, the same jury would be very likely to acquit, in the teeth of evidence, the man, who, having received a gross public insult, should have lawlessly avenged himself with his own hand. Some day we shall have an epidemic of this kind. It was announced the other day that a Vigilance Committee had been formed in England to restrain the "Social" Press. Duels about insults in journals are becoming very frequent in France; and though the practice is a barbarism, and would put society at the mercy of trained bullies, it points to the want, in our modern civilization, of an adequate tribunal of honour. No man, by merely buying a set of type, can invest himself with public functions or give himself an extraordinary jurisdiction over the characters of his neighbours; and if the State, by according postal privileges to journals, makes itself a party to the dissemination of the libel, it is all the more bound to provide the means of redress. Mr. Dudley Field advises persons whose character is assailed by newspapers to hold responsible, not the writers or editors, but the proprietors, a doctrine which writers and editors will no doubt approve.

We speak of personal libel, not of party mud-flinging, which will last as long as party, and in which every one has had more or less of a hand who has ever mingled in the fray. There is, no doubt, a dangerous affinity between the two, but party

abuse is balanced by party praise; no person of sense attends to either; and the result is more injurious to public manners than to anybody's reputation. It is only to be desired that the combatants should observe the laws of mud war, and spare the face and clothes of the harmless wayfarer. Some time ago one of our party organs, though not in its present hands, merely, as the editor avowed, for the purpose of injuring a Minister, raked up the obscure history of a poor devil, who, born probably under an evil star, had just scrambled out of the gutter into something like respectability, and was earning his bread by a petty employment in the Minister's department. Of course, the wretched man was ruined. Such a service rendered to party would have been fitly rewarded with expulsion from the profession.

—Once more comes from England—this time from our old friend Colonel Shaw—the announcement that the English are turning to Protection. Once more we reply that we have witnessed the movement of opinion which produces this impression, the disappointment at the slow progress of the Free Trade doctrine in Europe, and the resentment against nations which exclude British goods; but that the Manufacturer will never allow the Farmer to raise the price of food, nor will the Farmer allow the Manufacturer to raise the price of tools and clothing. The friends of the Farmer are suspected of trying to shut out foreign meat by the Act respecting Diseased Cattle, and the suspicion at once rouses the Manufacturers to arms. As to the Imperial sentiment in favour of Colonial produce, it has only a rhetorical existence.

—On the continent of Europe the one important event is the result of the French Departmental Elections, which is a great victory for the Republicans. It proves, beyond a doubt, not that the people are enthusiastically devoted to the Republic, which they are not, but that they acquiesce in it, and will

resist a reactionary revolution. A slight shadow fell across the scene. A letter of Gambetta, pointing to a renewal of the war with Germany, and the recovery of the Provinces, as the ultimate goal of Republican effort, found its way into the journals: it turned out that the letter was written some years ago, and De Freycinet has removed the bad impression by a moderate speech. Still, in that quarter lies the danger: war means military government, and the Republic will never be safe till reduction of armaments begins. The French peasantry, who pay the blood tax, would be only too glad to see reduction begin at once. Alsace and Lorraine are German; they are lost; and against them France may set off Savoy and Nice, to which she has certainly no better title than Germany has to her winnings in a war which was forced upon her, and in which had she been the loser, she would unquestionably have been mulcted of her territory up to the Rhine.

Belgium celebrates her jubilee. In spite of the fierce contests between her Liberals and Ultramontanes, in spite of the antagonism between the Flemish section, which properly belongs to Holland, and the French, or Walloon, section, which high-handed Diplomacy lumped with it, Freedom has turned out well for her; but at the banquet of liberty the sword will hang over her head, as well as over that of Holland, till Europe disarms and rectification of frontiers is at an end.

—Our readers will be pleased with Sir Edmund Beckett's little book on "The Origin of the Laws of Nature," It is a vigorous critique of the Materialistic Hypothesis. Laws, Sir Edmund contends, cannot exist without a will to enact them and a force to put them into execution. The will and the force must, according to the Materialistic hypothesis, be looked for in the atoms of which Matter consists: and it must be supposed that these atoms diffused over a space at least twice as wide as the orbit of Neptune agreed by some sort of convention or concurrent impulse so to act, and continue acting, as to pro-

duce and maintain the order of the universe, including the intelligence and the moral nature of man. With regard to the most universal of all the laws, for example, that of gravity, "we must embrace one of two alternatives: either that all the atoms spontaneously adopted this law and standard of attraction by chance, before there were any laws of nature to put an end to chance, which is absurd; or that "every atom, being self-existent, had the power to adopt what laws of nature it pleased, and that they all by some mysterious universal suffrage conveyed through the infinity of space, or through the immeasureable sphere of the primæval nebula, agreed on that law and intensity of gravity, and have steadily kept to that agreement ever since." If we cannot imagine such spontaneous law-making on the part of the atoms, we must admit the existence of a Power beyond; and we are thus led, not to God, but to the Unseen. Why, indeed, should we not believe in the Unseen? In the name of reason, what divine right or prerogative have these nerves of sight, touch, hearing, taste and smell, on which the materialist exclusively relies, that we should reject as necessarily untrustworthy all information derived from any other source? On what ground are we peremptorily to reject the evidence of the eye of the mind, or that of the eye of the soul? Materialism has always appeared to us to rest on an assumption as to the sole criterion of truth, which is natural in the case of an exclusive physicist, but for which no sound reason can be assigned. Our bodily senses, according to the Evolutionists, are the products of a process which we have no reason for pronouncing terminated, and therefore finality cannot be predicated of them or their indications. Nor is it a merely negative or "Agnostic," but a positive belief in the Unseen to which we are led. The existence beyond the sensible world of a Power of some kind from which the movements and order of the world proceed, is as certain now as the existence of something which caused the perturbations of Uranus was before the astronomers had actually discovered Neptune.

We cannot hold, however, with Sir Edmund Beckett, that in

overthrowing the Materialistic hypothesis, he has established the Theistic, or that in this sense Agnosticism becomes impossible. Beyond the primordial atoms of our world, or anything that resides in these, there must be some power that made them behave as they did, and continues to make them behave as they are doing; so much, his reasoning, and the reasoning of those who have preceded him in the same line, seems to us to prove: but it does not follow, as he assumes, that this power is "The Living God." He falls back on the old argument of Design and Beauty: but this argument, if limited in its scope to the order of the visible universe or anything implied in it and deducible from it, has been undermined. If there are proofs of Design, there are also proofs of Undesign; there is waste, failure, and, what is most mysterious of all, prodigality of suffering, apparently at variance with any conception of Divine Mercy and Justice. The Pessimists, in fact, are not very palpably wrong in saying that there is about as much evil in this world as it can bear without dissolution. "Teeth," says Paley, "were made to eat, not to ache." But if teeth were not made to ache, yet do ache, there is a failure of Design. No theory can reconcile actual phenomena with the Theistic hypothesis but one which avows that, for some good purpose or other, teeth were made to ache. The Design, in short, must be supposed not physical and temporary, but moral and eternal; and the key to the mystery must be sought in the direction of moral effort leading to some far off goal, not of physical or immediate satisfaction.

Still it is something to have proved the existence of the Unseen; and the proof which is demonstrative as regards the Origin of the Laws of Nature, is valid at least against any merely physical presumption that the soul of man must cease to exist when it ceases to belong to the Seen. "We see forms of matter," says Dr. Thomas Young,* "differing in subtility and mobility, under the names of solids, li-

* Quoted in "The Unseen Universe," p. 160.

quids, and gases; above those are the semi-material existences, which produce the phenomena of electricity and magnetism, and either caloric or universal ether. Higher still, perhaps, are the causes of gravitation, and the immediate agents in attraction of all kinds, which exhibit some phenomena apparently still more remote from all that is compatible with material bodies. And of these different orders of beings the more refined and immaterial appear to pervade freely the grosser. It seems, therefore, natural to believe that the analogy may be continued still further, until it rises into existence absolutely immaterial and spiritual. We know not but that thousands of spiritual worlds may exist unseen for ever by human eyes; nor have we any reason to suppose that even the presence of matter, in a given spot, necessarily excludes their existences from it. Those who maintain that nature always teems with life, wherever living beings can be placed, may therefore speculate with freedom on the possibility of independent worlds; some existing in different parts of space, others pervading each other unseen and unknown, in the same space, and others again to which space may not be a necessary mode of existence." Perhaps the view of the universe conveyed in such a passage places the possibility of a future state in a more vivid light, and renders it more capable of realization than the ordinary reasonings in which the material and the spiritual are opposed to each other as two entirely distinct kinds and spheres of being, from one to the other of which we are to be suddenly translated. Gradual advance in Spirituality is perfectly consistent with Evolution.

Sir Edmund Beckett is a little too combative. No one can have followed this unspeakably momentous discussion in a philosophic spirit without understanding, at least, the doubts which perplex humanity, and which extend to the highest moral natures as well as to the most powerful minds. We need all the force of intellect we have to work out our common salvation, and have none to waste on mutual assault and battery. It is true that the fanaticism and dogmatism of the

coarser scientists are sometimes very provoking; yet it is better to disregard the provocation. Sir Edmund Beckett himself has been borne along by the current: he is very far removed from Orthodoxy as it was fifty or even twenty years ago. Apparently he accepts the Nebular Hypothesis; and if he does he is committed to the general principle of Evolution, as contrasted with that of sudden and particular creation. Special theories of the process may be crude or false: too much efficacy may have been assigned to Natural Selection, though it is impossible to doubt the reality or the importance of that force: but surely we cannot take up any book of science, or any book of philosophy in which deference is paid to Science without seeing that the old Cosmogony is dead, and that its place has been taken by Evolution.

—Orthodoxy keeps its grasp on Professor Robertson Smith. "See," it exclaims, "if we let this man go free, what will be the logical consequences? Professors and ministers will be licensed to teach 1. That there are interpolations in Deuteronomy and perhaps in the Acts of the Apostles, or any other book of Scripture; 2. That the Song of Songs got into the Canon by mistake, the Church having erroneously supposed it to be allegorical; 3. That the Books of Jonah and Esther have in them poetical inventions which destroy their trustworthiness as history; 4. That the Synoptical Gospels are merely digests of apostolic tradition, not written by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, but by persons unknown and at the beginning of the second century; 5. That the Gospel of John is a product of abstract reflection, and therefore unhistorical. Who, then, will go to church to hear sermons on apocryphal writings? Will it not soon be here as it is in Germany, where not above five per cent. of the Protestant population attend church on the Sabbath, and Socialism and Nihilism are the results?" Such horror is most natural; such apprehensions are too well founded. To a religious man, brought up strictly in the orthodox belief, and

secured from contact with Scepticism, it may well appear that the foundations of the world are giving way, and that the end of all things is at hand. Of the heresies just enumerated, there is hardly one which may not be said at present to have the preponderance of learned and critical opinion in its favour; and it is difficult to resist the practical conclusion which is drawn by the alarmists. Yet, all these doubts as to the authorship and historical character of books may be well founded, and still Christianity may be a true account of the relations of man to God, and as such really and in the deepest sense divine. Suppose Newton, after completing the "Principia," had died suddenly; suppose the manuscript had gone astray and been ascribed to a wrong author; suppose that legends had grown up about its origin; still the "Principia" would be true. We do not mean to press the analogy too far; but when the work of critical demolition is complete, assuming that it extends permanently to the utmost limits which the tide of Scepticism has marked, the Character and the ethical system will remain; so will the Christian Church and the Christendom which it has produced. We have before noted the avowal of Mr. Herbert Spencer and other Positivist writers that after a period of hesitancy, or, to use the expression of one of them, "tacking," Ethics would probably move on again in the line traced by Christianity. What is this but saying that Christianity is fundamentally true?

Nevertheless tremendous questions present themselves. One regards our Church services, which unquestionably still rest on the orthodox hypothesis, and which it will be difficult to lift from that basis without wreck, though lifted in the end they will have to be, if the march of thought proceeds in its present course, and supposing that we wish to keep the comfort and the elevating influence of social worship. Another, perhaps still more pressing, concerns the education of the clergy. With this the Rev. Hugh Pedley, of Cobourg, deals very frankly and fearlessly in his paper on *Theological Students and the Times* in a recent number of the *Canadian Monthly*. What the

times are he fully acknowledges, freely admitting the power, the rapid progress, the increasing boldness, and the growing popularity of Rationalism, which, as he says, has now dominated the most thoughtful nation in Europe for fifty years. What training, then, is to be given to the ministers who, especially if their work is in the cities, are destined to encounter Rationalism everywhere and in all forms? Are they to make acquaintance with it only through the partial quotations and hostile criticism of the Orthodox lecture-room, or are they to study it thoroughly and for themselves? Mr. Pedley boldly embraces the second alternative. He would put the dangerous works "Supernatural Religion," Greg's "Creed of Christendom," Newman's "Phases of Faith," Baur, Haeckel, and Strauss into the student's hands and absolutely command him to read them; bid him grapple with Renan's axiom that the Essence of Criticism is the denial of the Supernatural; enjoin him to take nothing for granted but *cogito ergo sum;* let him "go down to the very bottom, and then work his way up by manful climbing till he found himself at last on the solid and sun-kissed heights of glorious conviction." Would the student, as the result of this heroic treatment, always, or even generally, find himself on the sun-kissed heights of conviction? Would he not often find himself in the twilight, or even in the darkness, of the valley of doubt? In the most favourable case would the process of building up from *cogito ergo sum* be over before the ordination day? However, there is no choice. A Roman Catholic seminary is an intellectual fortalice, in which the student is effectually guarded from the access of all opinion except what it suits his preceptors to instil, of all knowledge except that which it suits his preceptors to impart. Not a book, not a journal can he touch, saving with their cognizance and permission; intercourse with the outer world he has none; blissfully ignorant he generally comes in, blissfully ignorant of everything, except the routine of his profession, he goes out. But the safeguards of a Protestant seminary, its tests and the exclusive orthodoxy of its professional teaching,

are as gates of brass where there is no wall. They leave the inmates exposed to all the influences of the library, the book-store, the press, and general society. It is with mental seclusion as with persecution: it must be thoroughgoing, or, instead of repressing, it incites.

Supposing the question of clerical education settled, a greater difficulty remains. Is the clergyman, after his ordination, when he has dedicated himself to the service of his Church and its authoritative creed, to continue his course of free reading and free thought. We should say so, if it is a part of his duty to guide his congregation to the truth. But if he does, is it not possible that his faith may be shaken by the arguments of writers whose views "have for fifty years dominated the most thoughtful nation of Europe?" Is it not possible, at all events, that he may conceive doubts as to the historical character of the Books of Jonah and Esther, the spiritual meaning of the Song of Songs, or the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel? In that case, what is he to do? We can hardly doubt that the question has presented itself practically to not a few perplexed understandings and perturbed hearts. It is not for us to attempt its solution, either generally or in any given instance. We can only presume to speak of the duty and interest of the laity, which seem to us alike to point to a frank recognition of the difficulties under which the clergy, like the rest of us, and more than the rest of us, are placed, and, as a consequence of that recognition, to the concession of the fullest measure of liberty consistent with practical union. The result of inquisitorial narrowness, under such circumstances as the present, must be either disruption, with a total loss of the privileges of social worship, or the elimination from the ministry of all minds of the higher order, and of all sincere liegemen of the truth. Strict orthodoxy in the pulpit and in the rectory may, of course, be secured, for a sufficient consideration; and, by wealthy State Churches, it is secured in great abundance. If we want to find the right way, what can be more suicidal than to bandage the eyes of our guides? We

suspect that they are not the most highly educated members of a congregation or those best qualified to form an opinion on theological questions that usually trouble a clergyman about the doctrine which he teaches.

—Dr. Ryerson said, in the Preface to his "Loyalists of America," that the history of the Loyalists had never been written except by their enemies. We replied that it had been written by Mr. Lorenzo Sabine, who was very friendly to them, and by Judge Thomas Jones, who was one of them. To be perfectly candid, we were under the impression that the Jones manuscript had been published by the New York Historical Society at the end of 1878. The date 1879 on the title page would not have been inconsistent with this, since it is not uncommon to date as of the incoming, works published at the end of the outgoing, year. We find, however, that the work came out May 1, 1879. Still this leaves an interval of at least thirteen months between the appearance of Jones's history and that of Dr. Ryerson's; so that there could be no excuse for the statement in Dr. Ryerson's Preface, even as regards Jones, much less as regards Sabine, whose work has been out for many years. Jones's history being the most important document relating to the subject, we should have thought that its existence might have been noticed in some way, though there might not be time to work it up into the body of Dr. Ryerson's narrative. Even as a manuscript, in the hands of the Historical Society of New York, it hardly lay beyond the scope of very diligent research. The personal slanging-match to which the reverend Doctor, after his usual fashion, invites us, we beg leave to decline. When it comes to flinging dirt, he that has the greatest command of dirt must win.

—Canada suffers with regard to the Copyright Question by the inability of the English trade to recognise her position in a country adjoining the United States and exposed to American

competition, while her hands are tied by the English law. But, while publishers and authors, English and American, debate this question and propose their different solutions of it, the flood of cheap reprints has come upon them all. Not only novels with which the movement commenced; or reviews to which it next extended; but solid works of history, biography, criticism, science, philosophy, theology are now being brought out in the revolutionary form of broad-sheets, and at a revolutionary price. The regular firms having resisted the change of form, a good deal of the trade has already been transferred from them to news-dealers and printers. What will become of our old libraries with their goodly array of bound octavos? What will become of their proud possessors thus levelled in command of intellectual wealth with any one who can afford to lay out a few dollars? What will become of the regular publishers, whose stock and stereotype plates will, to no small extent, be rendered worthless, and who will hardly find it worth their while to advertise books and create a market for them with the certainty of having their issues at once outsold by the multitudinous cheap editions of the Quarto Libraries? What will become of the English authors, including the Musical Composer and the Playwright, when they have to look for their remuneration solely to the people of their own country, while the bulk of the sale, perhaps, is on this side of the Atlantic? Will the English readers submit for ever to exclusion from the Paradise of Cheap Reading, which they will see their kinsmen enjoying in the United States? Will the trade, either of publisher or writer, escape fundamental change? Will Copyright itself remain unshaken, or will it succumb and leave nothing but the advantage which belongs in the ordinary course of trade to the first producer? Unquestionably, the revolution will be great: but it was inevitable, and we may be sure it will prove beneficent; it is the intellectual complement of political democracy: the invention of printing was the first great step, the cheap library is the second.

Probably the book question will come before the next Con-

gress. There are now three Camps. In Camp the First is a double-winged army of publishers, with which act the native American writers, whom the deluge of cheap reprints threatens almost with annihilation. The whole army calls aloud, though rather late, for an international Copyright Treaty with England; but the right wing insists, in the interest of native industries, that reprints shall be manufactured in the United States, while the left wing would leave the matter open, so that English publishers may send in editions suited to the markets at their discretion. Importers and English agencies, of course, act with the left wing, which would remove the heavy duty on books: the interest of the native American writer inclines him to the right. In Camp the Second are the Philadelphia reprinters of law and medical works, who are unaffected by the cheap broadsides, and who oppose an international copyright and the removal of the book duty, but want the duty removed on paper, cloth, leather for binding, and other things used in the manufacture of books. Camp the Third contains the Jacobins of the literary revolution—the cheap reprinters, with the mass of the public as well as the paper-makers and printers at their back. These simply want to keep their indiscriminate licence of reproducing, untaxed by author's royalty, whatever comes into their hands. The case of the native American writer demands our utmost sympathy, and the most serious part of the matter is the peril in which native American literature is placed. Otherwise, the struggle among the three camps is simply one of trade interest in its narrowest form. There will be a good deal of lobbying and bribing, but the Jacobins will win.

THE BYSTANDER.

OCTOBER, 1880.

IT is always something to have your strongest man at the head of affairs, whatever his political sentiments may be. Like a powerful horse, if he gets you into a scrape, he pulls you through. Sir John Macdonald got us into a scrape, and something worse than a scrape, when he bound us to build the Pacific Railway in ten years; perhaps it may be found that he has now pulled us through as well as the circumstances of so bad a case permit. The favourable condition of the money market, combined with the well-known skill of our negotiator, and the inducements which he had to exert his utmost powers, are enough to assure us that our interests have not been thrown away; and there can be no doubt that any good, or even tolerable, arrangement which rids the country of the danger and uncertainty of this portentous undertaking will be welcomed by the mass of our people with the strongest sense of relief. Though the exact terms are not yet known, it appears to be understood that the Company is to receive twenty-five millions of dollars and twenty-five millions of acres of land, besides the lines already constructed at an estimated cost of thirty-one millions. The Company undertakes to run as well as construct the road. Including the sops to British Columbia and the excess of Government expenditure in the North-west, for general purposes, over the receipts from import duties, Canada will have sunk some sixty millions in the attempt to

give effect to the North-western policy; a policy on which, as we believe, Nature by severing from each other the territories assumed to be conterminous, and linking each of them to the region on the south of it, has inexorably put her veto. As a set-off we have the balance of the land, vast in extent, and much of it, no doubt, excellent in quality, by which Sir John Macdonald appears to believe that we shall eventually be fully recouped. On this point there is no certainty. That a tract of raw land, remote from existing markets, cannot be expected to do much more than provide roads and other things necessary to open it for settlement, is the impression which, we confess, we have formed, but which we can only submit to the verdict of more practical judges. Of this we feel sure, that the imagination of the public has been too much excited by eloquent descriptions of the fruitfulness of the soil, which, after all, is only one element of the question. It is the more necessary to bear this in mind, because the Opposition, for controversial purposes, has been led to exaggerate the value of the land, that it might charge the Government with throwing away the public property, and has thus committed itself to an estimate to which the Government, when pressed in debate, will, of course, triumphantly appeal. On such occasions as the present the nation feels the benefit of the party system which leaves it without unprejudiced advisers.

The value of land, whatever it may be, is more likely to be realized in the hands of a private company than in those of the Government. The failure of this year's immigration to verify the sanguine calculations of Sir John Macdonald, and the still more sanguine calculations of the *Globe*, is confidently ascribed by the opponents of the Government to the impolicy of the land regulations. We have never ventured, amidst the conflict of testimony and the cross-fire of recrimination, to form an opinion on that subject, though it seemed to us that the regulations were unfavourable to close neighbourhood, which is a great consideration in settling a new country. Perhaps the severity of the climate and the remoteness of the

situation, may have had something to do with the disappointment, as well as misdirected legislation. But the regulations and other arrangements of a Government, whether good or bad, are, as a matter of course, decried by the Opposition, whose disparaging descriptions scare away settlers. Nor can a Government, obliged daily to show a front to the criticism of its enemies, afford to play a long game by making the temporary sacrifices for the sake of future profit, which commercial policy often dictates. A company will be at liberty to give away land, if it thinks fit, to induce settlement; it will have no criticism to encounter, except that of commercial rivals, which everybody understands. The same frenzy of party-hatred which proclaims with premature glee the disastrous failure of the Minister as an event inspiriting to all true Canadians, will do its best to make the Minister fail. It used to be said that the students of two rival hospitals in England reciprocally attended surgical operations for the purpose of jogging the operator's arm.

Irrespectively of party detraction, everybody knows that a Government is the worst of commercial managers; it is undertaking a work for which it is not adapted, and which it never performs with the hearty and vigilant interest inspired by private gain. But the maladministration is the least part of the evil. Upon a great commercial enterprise carried on by a Government, with large expenditure and a multitude of contracts, jobbery, peculation and roguery of all kinds attend as certainly as pestilence upon miasma. We are getting, through the facts elicited by the Pacific Railway Commission, a glimpse of the gulf into which we were being drawn. Happy as is the escape of the country from economical disaster, her escape from political corruption is not less a cause for rejoicing. Had the Company to which the Road is to be transferred been a set of needy adventurers, political mischief of another kind would have been in store for us; the government and the legislature would then have been constantly exposed to the machinations of a gigantic lobby; but, fortunately, notwithstanding

the refusal of certain great English and French firms, from which arose the rumour of Sir John Macdonald's failure, it appears that a thoroughly strong Syndicate, headed by Canadian capitalists, has been formed. There will be little reason to apprehend lobbying; and as the capital is sure to be forthcoming, there will be no issuing of a flood of bonds, the holders of which might be soon cursing the Canadian name.

From what we have said it will be clear that it is from no hostility to the Government or its scheme that we venture to enter a strong caveat on one point. Everybody must see that to carry the line round the north of Lake Superior, through an irreclaimable wilderness, full of engineering difficulties, when it can be carried to the south through a practicable and peopled country, is, in a commercial point of view, sheer madness. There is not, we imagine, one dissentient voice upon this subject. But the Prime Minister has what may be called the weaknesses of a strong character; he cannot bear to give up anything with which he has once been identified. That he should actually give up the line to the north of Lake Superior is not necessary; his pride need not be touched; though if he reflects upon the history of this affair he can hardly fail to be conscious that he owes to the country at least the sacrifice of his pride. But it is necessary, and we trust Parliament will do its duty by insisting, that the construction shall be postponed, and that the nation shall, in the meantime, be left at liberty to consider maturely whether it is worth its while to subsidize that part of the line for the political and military purposes which alone it can serve. The grant to the Company may, of course, be apportioned so as to leave room for such separate consideration. Already Canada is burdened with a public debt almost as large as that of the United States in proportion to her population, and larger in proportion to her resources; and of this by far the greater part has been incurred in the construction of politico-military railways, the Intercolonial and the Pacific, and in other objects of Imperial policy, commercially unprofitable, and in which our people have no special interest, while to the great

mass of the people in the Mother Country, who share no aristocratic dreams of an Anti-American Empire, they are equally matters of indifference. It is about time that a reasonable limit should be put to the load which is to laid on the shoulders of the Canadian people.

We never want to sail under false colours. Our belief is that the line round the north of Lake Superior, if the country is not forced to construct it at once, will never be constructed at all; because, while commercial inducements there are none, the political and military inducements will every day grow less, and our people will become more and more convinced that amicable partnership, not the jealous antagonism which the Anti-Continental policy with its military roads implies, is their destined relation to that part of their race whose abode adjoins them on the south. The original parties to the old quarrel, which we feel locally bound to perpetuate, have themselves buried the memory of their feud. The principals have withdrawn, the second only keeps the field. The author of "Tom Brown," a Briton of the Britons, chooses, as the site of his English settlement, Tennessee. People are surprised that he should prefer a "foreign" country. The answer is that to an Englishman America is no longer foreign, nor is England foreign to an American. International Reviews and International Boat Races are symbols of the social and intellectual fusion which is going on. Intermarriages are becoming daily more frequent. An English Duke and an English Tory Minister send their sons into mercantile houses in New York. Aristocratic antagonism to Republican institutions, no doubt, is not extinct, nor will it be while political differences last; but with this democratic Canada has nothing to do; and the general feeling of the English people towards the United States differs not at all from their feeling towards any English colony. Even the aristocracy, since the victory of the Union, has been laboriously civil to the Republic, as a power. Just on this spot, where the refugees of the American Revolution fixed their abode, the embers of the feud of last century are kept alive by

assiduous blowing: otherwise they are cold. In spite of family law-suits about boundaries and fisheries, everything tends towards the effacement of the last vestige of a conflict in which, after all, the bulk of the English people had no part. Everything forebodes a perfect reconciliation of the English-speaking race. Even here, in spite of the United Empire tradition, the signs not only of reconciliation, but of fusion, are all around us. We have just seen the banners of the American mingling with those of the Canadian Odd Fellows in the streets of Toronto; and this is only one example of the organizations of all kinds, social, religious, commercial and intellectual, which ignore the existence of the dividing line. The exodus to the States is not a very pleasant theme; but those who revel in the thought of "sending rifle-bullets through a Frenchman, a Russian or a Yankee," will have to take care that their bullets know how to discriminate between a Yankee and a Canadian settled in the United States, to say nothing of the fact that a million of our people are Frenchmen. We lavish money in founding a Military College for the training of officers to lead us against American invaders; and the first thing we hear is that one of our cadets, after having completed his military education, has gone off to earn his livelihood as an engineer at Chicago. The fortification of Montreal was an essential part of the scheme of Confederation. What has become of the fortification of Montreal? Of a political federation, extending over the whole globe, it is absurd to dream; but a moral re-union of all who own Great Britain as their parent and speak the tongue of Shakespeare is an idea which is fast, though silently, becoming a fact, and against which it is as useless to wrestle with angry denunciations and appeals to evil memories as it would be to wrestle against the diffusion of the morning light.

Only in case the Government is obstinate about conceding to the nation the necessary freedom of deliberation with regard to the line north of Lake Superior, or anything else which might require further consideration, will it be in place to recur to the errors of the past. Let us dismiss the past from our

thoughts and do what is best at present and for the future The Opposition has no stones to cast at the Government. Had Mr. Mackenzie, when he came into power, acted on what we can hardly doubt was the dictate of his own good sense, by frankly declaring that the agreement with British Columbia was impracticable and must be rescinded, we firmly believe that he would have had the people with him; but misled, as party politicians very often are, by conventional opinion, instead of rescinding, he signed anew the fatal bond, made the enterprise a Government work, and showed his misgivings by a hesitancy in the execution and an attempt to find a middle course, which apparently would, in the end, have served only to increase the expense. His organ, or rather his leader, never ceased, under the influence of Anti-Continental sentiment, to goad the nation on to the undertaking, and to the last insisted on the immediate construction of the Mountain line, covering with foul aspersions all who opposed that course, though it now turns round and designates the policy as waste.

Ought the Pacific Railway agreement to be laid before the country at once, or ought it to be reserved for the meeting of Parliament? In demanding that it shall be laid before the country at once, the Opposition organ is, no doubt, mainly actuated by that precipitate eagerness to condemn which has led it to forfeit in advance for itself, and as far as it could for its party, every semblance of critical authority in passing judgment on the scheme. But the best friends of the Government, would, we venture to think, advise it to be as frank as possible in its dealing with the people, and when the material parts of the agreement are settled, to communicate it to the public without delay. The dignity of Parliament is a very good thing, but it is also well that in a question which is one of financial life or death to the country, Parliament should enter on its deliberations with all the light that the fullest and most searching discussion can throw upon the subject. The nation will not be satisfied with an arrangement disclosed only to be carried through the House by a party majority at the bidding

of the Minister by whom the arrangement has been made. Already there has been more than enough of the dignity of Parliament in this matter. Sixty millions would have been saved if the Treaty with British Columbia had, in the first instance, been fairly submitted to the good sense of the people.

—It may safely be said, we believe, that the attempts of certain journalists styling themselves Liberals, to limit freedom of discussion in Canada and to crush by personal libel those who presumed to pass the limit, after several years of unscrupulous and venomous persistency, have ended in failure, "final, total, and disastrous,"—to borrow the phrase rather unluckily applied by these journalists themselves to the mission of Sir John Macdonald. Suspicion of personal and commercial motives lurking beneath professions of jealous loyalty have probably helped, in this particular case, to decide the public verdict; but it may also be affirmed that the principle has triumphed. It is a principle which we all must accept, however great may be our unwillingness to surrender some cherished dogma or institution to the general ordeal. What have been the fruits of the opposite system carried out on a large scale? Dreadful wars, international and civil, were waged, millions of men were destroyed, civilization was thrown back in its course, the earth was made an Aceldama to exempt from free discussion certain theological dogmas and a certain form of church government; we now find ourselves freely discussing, in all countries, the very existence of a God, while the general belief in religion rests no longer on authority, but on the testimony of those who are regarded as competent to enquire, and courageous enough to tell the truth. Efforts not less desperate and sanguinary have been made to protect political dogmas, especially dynasticism, against the advance of thought; yet these efforts have not saved us, after all, from the necessity of defending with the arms of reason the fundamental principles of society against the Communist and the Nihilist. Does any one

think that the failure was due to the inadequacy of the measures of repression or to want of persistency in their application? Could repression be carried further or applied with more persistency than it was in Spain? Yet in Spain it has failed at last. Nor is mere failure the only result: Conservative principles have been discredited by futile protection, and an artificial impulse has been given to revolution. To what does Mr. Buckle appeal throughout his book but to the suspicion with which protected dogmas and institutions are naturally regarded? Leave thought to its free course, and doctrines favourable to order are not less acceptable to the human mind than doctrines favourable to progress; perhaps, with regard to the mass of men, the reverse would be found to be the case. In ordinary natures use and wont are at least as powerful as the love of experiment or the hope of benefits to be derived from change. The idea that men not oppressed or seriously inconvenienced by an established system can be induced by speculative reasonings to fling themselves into a violent revolution, though it has been put forward among ourselves as a justification for gagging the press, is, in truth, the most preposterous of chimeras. Even Voltaire and Rousseau could never have raised a mob or thrown up a barricade by their writings without the aid of maddening oppression, bankruptcy and famine. On this continent, the realm of democracy, it is Conservatism, not Liberalism, that most needs to be sheltered by the ægis of inviolable liberty; and, to do the Americans justice, not only Conservative, but anti-popular opinions are published with perfect freedom in their press. Nor are they published without effect; in some of the State constitutions changes of no slight importance have been made in a Conservative direction within the last fifteen years. Apart from bayonets or the influence of superstition, there is no conceivable basis for institutions or warrant for authority but public assent; and there can be no assurance of public assent without perfect freedom of discussion. If there is any danger in unrestricted heterodoxy, it is slight compared with that which at-

tends the weakening of spontaneous allegiance produced by attempts at restriction, and it is diminished by every improvement of popular education. Nihilism may safely be licensed to preach or hawk its doctrines in a country governed by just laws and inhabited by a contented people; the more extravagant its sentiments are, the more they will repel, and the more impotent it will be; but it might become formidable if it could point to the existence of the gag as a proof of fear and conscious wrong-doing on the part of a privileged class.

In Canada we have some curious remnants of the idea, dominant everywhere in days gone by, and still dominant in Islam, that intolerance on certain questions is a duty and a virtue. The good St. Louis of France used to say that he would never argue with a heretic who doubted Papal doctrine, but give him six inches of cold steel; and we have lately been told that among ourselves there are questions which are to be debated only sword in hand. There are some special factors in our political composition, such as United Empire Loyalism, Orangeism, and the surviving sentiment of Anglican establishmentarianism, which may explain the phenomenon without disparagement to our intellectual civilization. It is remarkable, however, that, as we have said, the recent attempts to maintain the dominion of intolerance have proceeded not from Conservatives, but from writers who usurp and sully the name of Liberal. We have felt the more indifferent to the charge of disloyalty when it was brought by the representatives of the party which had shorn the Crown of all real power, and which was in fact the heir of the Revolutionists of 1837.

The battle tendered by these gentlemen, however disagreeable, could not be declined by independent journalism without betrayal of duty. The Anti-Continental policy was not a mere sentiment or an airy speculation; it was imposing on Canada the construction of the Pacific Railway; the danger of financial disaster with its political consequences stared us in the face; and all our public men, even those whose real convictions could not be doubtful, seemed spell-bound by their political

superstitions. The only chance of rescue lay in the awakening of the public mind, by frank and fearless discussion of the enterprise, and of the general policy to which it belonged, and apart from which no rational estimate of it could be formed. In the debate, we, like our antagonists, have of course advocated our own views; but we can sincerely say, that far above the advocacy of our own views, we have placed the vindication of that liberty without which all other liberties are at once poor and frail. Nor was the struggle only for freedom of political discussion; it was for an open career. The self-constituted dictators who undertake to keep the keys of public debate, undertake also to keep the keys of public life, and to decide who shall be deemed "fit," and who shall be deemed "unfit" for the service of the State. The fit are the servile: the unfit are the independent; and the instrument for excluding the unfit, and elevating national morality at the same time, is systematic slander. The "fit" must be ready to veer as well as to cringe; one day they must invoke anathemas on all who would touch the Senate; next day they must swell the cry for immediate and unqualified abolition. Any young man of spirit who looks forward to public life may regard, at least with sympathy, efforts, which, even if misdirected in respect of their immediate object, and unprofitable to those who make them, cannot fail to have the effect of giving him a fairer field and a better chance; while the thought that something has been done towards clearing the path for a more independent and fearless generation of Canadian statesmen may well be deemed a sufficient compensation for anything that defenders of free discussion have undergone.

—Every tidal wave of opinion is followed by a considerable ebb. In England the Liberals, since their astonishing victory, have lost several elections, and the swell of N. P. enthusiasm which bore Sir John Macdonald so high two years ago has been followed by a similar subsidence. The point of extraordinary

interest having been gained, Jingoism having been voted down, or the N. P. voted up, ordinary influences, party and personal, resume their sway. This seems enough to account for the decrease of the Government majority in West Toronto, and for the increase of the Reform majority in North Ontario. In West Toronto, moreover, there was probably an uncommon number of those disappointed applicants for patronage whose resentment, as the evil trade of politics draws more adventurers into it, will be found a source of increasing danger to the stability of administrations. The verdict of the bye elections is practically favourable to the Government, because it shows that nothing like a decisive reaction had set in even before the success of the Pacific Railway negotiations, which relieves the Ministry of a heavy load. As to the victory in Selkirk, over which the Government journals are jubilant, to the land of contracts, we apprehend, belong both the victory and its significance.

The West Toronto election brought the new leader of the Opposition into the field. He showed his oratoric power in smiting the enemy ; perhaps in a local election-fight he could hardly be expected to propound a policy of his own, though it will soon be time for him to do something in that way, that his followers may have a reason for following. He belaboured the N. P., and went back once more to the Pacific Scandal. Belabouring the N. P., if we may venture to offer an opinion, is not the very best strategy. The *Globe*, by assailing every Canadian industry that is doing anything for itself, as though its prosperity were a public wrong, is providing the Government at the next election with a body of supporters who will fight with the energy of despair. Mr. Blake himself at one time appeared to see that it was better to let the experiment on which the nation had decided by an immense majority run its course, and be judged by its practical results, than to denounce it incessantly on abstract grounds. "National" is a name as congenial to his sentiments as it is uncongenial to the sentiments of the *Globe*. As to the Pacific Scandal, no

right-minded man, Mr. Blake may be assured, has changed his opinion about it, or ceased to regard it as a most disastrous and humiliating proof of the evil tendencies of the party system, but all men of sense begin to think it time it should be buried. Not only does it belong to the past, but the habit of perpetually recurring to it and trusting to it as an inexhaustible source of appeals to popular feeling, blinds the Opposition leaders to the necessity of placing their claim to public confidence on higher and better grounds.

All is not yet harmony in the Opposition camp. Mr. Blake's appearance in the West Toronto election was the signal for a renewal by the Grit organ of an attempt to "whip him back into the traces" over the shoulder of some one who is supposed to share his sentiments. To imagine him capable of yielding to such coercion a second time, would be to set him down as not only destitute of the courage without which no man can hope to lead his fellows, but of ability to profit by the plainest lessons of experience. He must surely see that had he held his ground five or six years ago, and taken the line which his own general principles would have prompted him to take about the Pacific Railway and the National Policy, he and his following would now, to say the least, be in a very different position. He is again obliquely charged with disloyalty; that is with cloaking an inclination for Independence beneath his faltering advocacy of Imperial Federation. If he deigned to reply he might say that disloyalty is a vague term, and used in different senses; meaning sometimes a breach of that personal allegiance to a feudal lord or sovereign which formed the political morality of the Middle Ages; sometimes betrayal of a great principle; sometimes like the French *deloyauté*, want of fidelity to special rules of duty, such as the code of professional honour: that in the first sense nobody can be more palpably guilty of it than a man who leaves his native allegiance to settle in a foreign country; in the second sense, than a member of a free press who attacks freedom of opinion; in the third sense, than a journalist who uses his journal as the instrument of private ends or personal malice.

A hope seems still to linger in the Grit breast not only of whipping Mr. Blake into the traces, but of setting aside the independent chief and bringing back the "Faithful." What the *Globe* "longs for" is "the return to power of men of practical judgment and business prudence and forethought, like Messrs. Mackenzie and Cartwright." Fortune, no doubt has surprises in store for us; but the surprise will be great if Canada ever again has Mr. Mackenzie as the head of her Government, and Sir Richard Cartwright as her Minister of Finance. We say it with unfeigned respect for the ability and character of both men. They served and represented special influences now nearly extinct, and the exceedingly narrow ledge on which they stand is being fast overflowed by the advancing tide of independent opinion. Never did leaders more completely fail to read a situation, or more signally throw away the chances of a party than did those who, on the eve of the last election, turned the depressed industries of Canada with contumely from their door. A slight concession, almost a sympathizing word, would have saved them and their adherents from a ruinous overthrow.

—We have seen no denial of the statement that a member of the Local Government of Ontario took an active part in carrying round the hat for the Opposition candidate in the West Toronto election. We do not blame the Minister of Education for doing what all his compeers do: but we note the circumstance as one among the innumerable proofs of the close connection of these Provincial Cabinets, under the present system, with the central parties, and of the hollowness of the pretence that by doing away with them, and substituting really Local Councils of a practical and inexpensive kind, Provincial self-government would be impaired. Provincial self-government, on the contrary, would gain greatly by the change, and local business would be better managed, if its administrators had both eyes fixed on their proper work, instead of having one always fixed on Ottawa. The Ontario Government and its patronage

are in the hands of the Opposition, which finds them a useful engine of party, and naturally wishes to keep them on the present footing if it can. Its organ denounces as malefactors all who, like the member for Russell, advocate simplification and economy. Nevertheless the feeling in favour of simplification and economy gains ground.

—Everything betokens an undiminished plethora of money, and consequently a continued fall in the rate of interest and a further advance in the price of all sound securities. The reduction of the debt of the United States is every year driving a mass of capital to look for employment elsewhere. England has made immense accumulations and is seeking investments for them all over the world. She is likely for the future to have less of the character of a producing, and more of that of an investing, nation. The revival of commercial enterprise, especially in the States, is increasing the demand for capital; but the supply appears still far greater than the demand. An easy money market is good for debtors, and what is good for debtors is good for Canada. This country privately as well as publicly must be carrying, in proportion to its resources, a very heavy load of debt. Banks and loan societies of late have been thrusting money, largely drawn from England, on the merchants and farmers; and when the lender solicits the borrower the state of things is no longer safe. If there were any legislation of a communistic character to which we should be disposed, it would be an Act enabling the farmers at any time to pay off their mortgages with interest up to date. This, with an easy money market, would be a large measure of relief, and little practical injustice would be done. It might even, under certain circumstances, be an advantageous arrangement for the mortgagees, who, if a bad harvest should be closely followed by a general election, would be in some danger of being payed in National Currency instead of gold. The small vote polled by the Fiat money candidate in West Toronto is not a fair measure of what might occur if the great

farming interest should find itself ground down by debt, and be persuaded that Fiat currency would bring it relief. It must be remembered, too, that our Beaverbackers are only an outlying portion of the Greenback party, which is far from being extinct in the United States. Some of the Beaverback leaders are at this moment on the stump in favour of the Greenback candidate for the Presidency; a proof that, as we said before, the labour interest and its movements have ceased to be divided by the line. The same might also be almost said of the currency itself, for American paper is now current for all but government purposes in Canada; a circumstance which may add to the difficulties of the Fiat men when they proceed, as they propose, to proportion the issue of their paper exactly to the wealth of this country.

—The stockholders of the Consolidated Bank are still on the war path, and it is in place to remark, that bank-stockholders in general seem to have somewhat fallacious ideas of their position. They seem to think that their case is in some way distinguished from that of the stockholders of ordinary companies, that mismanagement of their concerns is a peculiarly heinous offence, and that they are entitled to some special protection at the hands of Government. There is no ground for such a notion. Holders of stock in a bank are just in the same position as holders of stock of any other kind; the public at large has no interest in their affairs; the Government has nothing to do with them; they must look for security to their own judgment in the choice of a directory and vigilance in watching its conduct; if they fail, their failure is just like that of any other set of men who undertake a commercial enterprise, and they have no more reason to raise an outcry or invoke the interposition of the State. The only thing with which the public and the Government are concerned is the circulation, and this, for the special reason which we have mentioned before, that bank bills, though not legal tender, cannot, in the ordinary course of commerce, be

scrutinized and refused like promissory notes and paper of other kinds. On this account the Government is entitled and bound to see that bills are not issued without a money basis sufficient to secure the taker. Its duty in short is not to the stockholder, but to the bill-holder and to him alone. Nor, on the other hand, is the Government or the nation in any way injured by the failure of the bank, as a private enterprise, or by the loss of the money which the stockholders have invested. If the bank stockholder appeals to the Government to afford him special protection against the misconduct of directors, he admits that the banks are not private enterprises but public institutions, and from that admission, when demagogues are in power, he will find that sinister consequences flow. Banking is a trade like other trades no more entitled to protection, no more justly liable to meddling, than the rest: that is the only consistent view and the only safe ground on which to stand.

—The visit of the Odd Fellows has set us moralizing on Secret Societies. One thing is certain; they gratify the love of title, costume, pageantry and parade. "The child is father of the man;" and the man even when highly civilized and a citizen of a Republic retains strong traces of his parentage. At Chicago twenty thousand Knights Templar underwent, for the sake of figuring in a superb procession, what their mediæval namesakes might have undergone in a Syrian campaign. It is curious, too, to observe how the military taste survives under the reign of industry, and how fond a peaceful tradesman is of marching through the streets in the guise of a warrior with a cocked hat and a drawn sword. Perhaps the love of secresy and mystery may all be explained as simply infantine, without resorting to the less amiable hypothesis of the Orator of the Odd Fellows who pleaded the necessity of throwing a shroud of darkness round the strong box. We fully believed the Orator when he solemnly declared that no secret of real importance was withheld by his Order from mankind. If Odd Fellows or

Freemasons appeared to know better than the uninitiated which way stocks were going, there might be reason for public disquietude. Our theory would require qualification, if it should appear, from social statistics, that the members of the community most noted for hard common sense were the chief bearers of society titles and the chief wearers of society regalia. It would not be easy to defend these associations in the court of strict reason. In spite of all disclaimers, the artificial bond which they create can hardly fail in some degree to disparage, if not to weaken, that of natural duty. A touching story was told by the Orator of a wounded unionist soldier, who being an Odd Fellow, was saved from death by confederate soldiers belonging to the same Order. Supposing the wounded man had not been an Odd Fellow, would he have been left to his fate? It does not appear that the Good Samaritan belonged to any Lodge. However, we are not aware that any evidence has ever been produced of evil consequences of this kind. There is, practically, more reason to fear political intrigue. Perhaps to the mass of citizens, who either do not belong to the party, or do not go to caucus, and have nothing to say to the nominations, it matters little whether they are in the hands of a secret society of Grits, or in those of a secret society of Odd Fellows. The rule of the Odd Fellows would probably be the more liberal and genial of the two. Associations whose motto is brotherly love, are at all events practically useful as counter attractions to others, whose motto is brotherly hatred.

—Every one will welcome the appointment of Professor Wilson to the Presidency of University College as a recognition both of literary merit and of long and faithful service. It is a pity that the decision was so much delayed as to make the new President appear not as a free choice but a last resource. This interminable imbroglio has been damaging to the Local Government, as well as most injurious to the University, in which it has gratuitously stirred up jealousies and heart-burn-

ings, the traces of which will not speedily disappear. One cause of the trouble appears to have been a fancy about the indefeasible superiority of classical studies, which we have shewn to be untenable, and which in fact seems to have arisen from a too limited induction ; for it is only at Oxford that the Classics have reigned supreme; at Cambridge Mathematics were long the dominant, and still are the favoured, study. Another cause seems to have been a desire on the part of the dispensers of the patronage to buy a shilling's worth of goods with sixpence. The salary of a professorship being insufficient to attract a first-rate man, an attempt was made to add to it, in appearance, by tacking to it a Vice-Presidency, and by holding out, or suggesting, hopes of the Presidency in reversion, a course which could not fail to breed complications. The influence of party politics is seldom absent, and is plausibly conjectured to have been felt in this affair also. The denominational colleges are, at all events, free from that bane; while the sectarianism which they cannot wholly escape may be reduced to a minimum by large-minded administrators such as the Principals of Victoria and Queen's. Their immunity is shared by McGill University at Montreal, which has just received a noble donation (not the first we believe) from Mr. Redpath, who would scarcely have been so ready to give his money to an institution under the control of a local party Government. Queen's College, thanks to the energy of its Principal, has also been largely adding to its endowments. The University of Toronto, weighted as recent events have shown it to be, is likely to be exposed to a serious competition.

—Different pictures are, of course, given by the Government and the Opposition papers of the condition of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. The truth we believe to be that in the Maritime Provinces little improvement has taken place; that the outlook remains gloomy, that ship-building is dull and that the people are still dissatisfied with the New Tariff and angry with

its framers, so that a general election would be almost certainly disastrous to the Government. In the City of Quebec, matters appear to be mending; the people are employed, and there are no fears of a riot this Fall. All the Provinces are cheered by good crops; Quebec is going to try Beet Sugar, and we wish her success greater than that which usually attends an industrial *tour de force*. Strafford's creation of the linen trade in Ireland is about the only instance which we know in economical history of a *tour de force* which has turned out well. Political news from Quebec is always pretty much the same, relating largely to personal combinations and changes, actual or surmised. One of our contemporaries was the other day deploring the bitterness of Quebec politics in connection with some incivility which had been shown from party motives to M. Frechette the poet. The only wonder is that the bitterness is not greater, considering that the parties to the struggle are professional politicians, fighting not about any question of principle, but for their bread.

—Writers who bid us sympathize with the Democratic party in the Presidential contest, simply because it is the party of Free Trade, are hardly in a position to denounce others who pay regard to economical considerations as "advocates of a policy of hogs." It is doubtful whether the Democratic party can be rightly called, in a practical sense, a party of Free Trade. No doubt there are more Protectionists in the Republican than in the Democratic camp; but there are Protectionists in both camps, and hitherto the Protectionists in the Democratic camp have proved strong enough to restrain the whole army from making any effectual movement in the direction of Free Trade. The truth is that while the Protectionists are ardent and energetic, like other people fighting for their own interests, the mass of the people are, or have up to this time been, luke-warm. They do not keenly feel the import duties which they pay; they see that the national finances flourish, and they like the idea of encouraging home industry. Even the western farmer, to whom

free traders always point as the great sufferer by protection, uses no great amount of imported goods, and is little excited by the story of his own wrongs, In the newspapers, for the most part, the subject is not often mentioned. The Democratic party, therefore, has not been inclined to risk the allegiance even of a small section of its supporters by making a party issue of the Tariff. Reduction is perhaps more likely to come as the consequence of the payment of the national debt than from a legislative change of principle. He must be a Protectionist indeed who, when taxes had ceased to be needed for the purposes of government, would desire to impose them simply for the exclusion of foreign goods.

For our own part, we never can treat the subject of a Presidential election, or of any party contest in such a community as the United States, without repeating that we hold these conflicts to be the greatest of evils, and fraught with danger to the stability of the Republic; that we deny the necessity of party government and of organized parties altogether; that we do not believe in the usefulness of an elective Presidency, or of any Republican reproduction of King, Lords and Commons, but are convinced that the Republic would be better, more safely, and more honestly governed by a single Assembly elected by the State Legislatures, as the Senate now is, though with a due reference to the population of each State, and itself electing in turn an Executive Council, without the introduction of party at all. In the possibility, to which everybody is now looking forward with dread, of a disputed election, and a political convulsion as its consequence, we see another confirmation of our views. But as the battle must be fought, and good citizens, instead of uniting their forces against the evils which threaten the whole state, are doomed to turn their swords against each other, it seems to us desirable in the interests of the United States, of this Continent, and of humanity at large, that the Republicans should win. The Third Term movement has been defeated, and in defeating it the purer and better section of the party has gained a decisive ascendancy over that which had

been corrupted by power. Long before Garfield was nominated, and when there seemed little prospect of his nomination, we avowed our belief that he was the best man for President. With bloody-shirt fanaticism, or negrophilist extravagances, we have no sympathy whatever. The issue between National Sovereignty and State Right, of which much is made in the campaign manifestoes and pamphlets, does not seem to us to be in itself of much practical importance; State separation, let it be carried in theory as far as it will, is sure to be controlled in practice by social and commercial unity: the party in power, whichever it be, is sure to incline to centralization, the party out of power is sure to incline against it. What we regard, are the influences which are arrayed on either side, and which, according as victory declares for one party or the other, will practically control the Government. It would be very unjust to say that everything which is Democratic is evil; but it would not be so very unjust to say that nearly everything which is evil is Democratic. The Solid South, which is the heart of the whole party, and more than any other element will control its corporate action, is evil, though its bad character may be deemed the disastrous heritage, not the fault, of the existing generation. The character of the Southerner, so far as it partakes of that of the slave-owners, has been formed under influences unfavourable to regard for human rights, to respect for law, to love of equality, to republican principles generally, and at the same time to high civilization. It is, and almost boasts of being, a character not of legality and good citizenship, but of domineering violence, It has repelled, among other humanizing agencies, that of popular education. Abroad it has, and deserves, the sympathy of all who desire the overthrow of republican institutions. At home it is allied with everything at the North that a true son of the Republic has most reason to dread. With it goes the great mass of the Irish immigrants, who, while fresh from their unhappy training in Ireland, and devoid of all political ideas and sentiments except the craving for personal leadership, which reigns in the heart of the clansman, are

the credulous retainers of the worst political adventurers, and the unhappy liegemen of municipal misgovernment. In vain did O'Connell, in his best mood and in his most fervent tones, conjure Irishmen in America not to sully the Irish cause by supporting slavery: slavery and the slave-owner have always been supported by the Irish. The most consummate embodiment of political evil has always been Tammany. A good citizen might be sure that in voting against Tammany he was voting for the welfare of the Republic. But Tammany has always been Democratic. The other day there was a passing disagreement between the Tammany leaders and the Tilden section of Democrats about some local question; but this quarrel of lovers has proved the renewal of love, and Tammany and the Democracy have rushed into each other's arms. A respectable Democrat, it is true, always affects to hold Tammany at arm's length; but he goes to the poll with it; he manages New York elections in concert with it; and he has to account for the connection and to explain what it was that Mr. William Tweed saw in the Democratic party so congenial to himself and so favourable to his objects? If, as the Democrats assert, they are the great Reformers, why should they allow their cause to be contaminated and compromised by association with such a den of corruption? This is a point which needs explanation. So, for cognate reasons, does the return of General Butler and his followers in Massachusetts, as by irresistible gravitation, to the Democratic ranks. But there is another body of auxiliaries in the Democratic camp, whose presence is even more ominous than that of the Tweeds. American Nihilism is mainly an importation from Europe, and it happily assumes in a land of popular government and generally diffused wealth a far milder character than that which it assumes among suffering proletariats and long-gathered elements of discontent in the Old World. Nevertheless it is there. Kearney is the leader of a throng, not inconsiderable in numbers, and sure to be joined, in case of a conflict, by the swarming tramps, which is the enemy of all civilization, which hates all kinds of industry but the coarsest,

all wealth though made and saved by the most honest toil and thrift, all education and refinement; which wants to gratify its appetites by public pillage instead of making its bread by labour; which would like to set the social edifice on fire and plunder it while it was burning. Kearney and his crew represent the lowest and worst section of the party of destruction; the Greenbackers represent the highest. Undoubtedly there are Greenbackers who are perfectly respectable people, honest dupes of an economical fallacy, as Mr. Spooner and other worthy men were in England: but Greenbackism really means Repudiation, private as well as public, and though not every Greenbacker is a Kearneyite or has any sort of sympathy with Kearneyism, every Kearneyite is a Greenbacker. There is a natural affinity and a political connection between the ruder and the more refined form of spoliation. Many Democrats are honest money men; probably most of the leaders are so; though Mr. Thurman unquestionably tampered with Greenbackism in Ohio. But in Maine we see a complete junction of Democrats with Greenbackers under the name of Fusionists, and find them combining under Garcelon to carry the State by fraud. The better Democrats throughout the Union and the better part of the Democratic press repudiated the Maine frauds; but the Fusionist league is not broken, and it must be assumed that the Greenback element of it remains convinced, notwithstanding the disapproving tap of the moral fan, that the Democrats are really its best friends, and that their victory is its own. We should feel that this connection also needed explanation if we were called upon to cast a Democratic vote. We should, in this case again, have to ask why it is that all things most lawless and dangerous seem to range themselves on the same side. The honourable leaders of the party no doubt flatter themselves that they can use a Solid South, the Irish, Tammany, Greenbackism and Kearneyism in recovering power and set them at nought, or baulk them of their object when power has been recovered. This, to begin with, is slippery work, but the notion is a mere delusion. Democratic government will be a government of the

South, the Irish, Tammany, Greenbackism and Kearneyism combined, though not harmonized, and perhaps more or less managed by a leading element of strong plutocracy. From such a Government we do not see how reform, or good of any kind is to be expected. Civil service reform would be more hopeless than ever, and the only retrenchment that would be likely to take place would be the cutting down of the army in the interest of Kearneyism and disorder. The last Congress was Democratic, and nothing could possibly be less promising in every respect than its conduct, or look less like reform. A party which has long been out of power is of course the enemy of administrative abuses; its leaders may be sincerely anxious for purification; but no party can be pure; all parties have to buy support; and it is not likely that the fell necessity will be surmounted by the virtue of Tammany.

The Republican party has suffered in character, beyond all doubt, by a long tenure of power, comprising eight years of Grant, who though, as we firmly believe, above corruption himself, allowed it to be practised by his lieutenants in the supposed interest of the party, and when one of his adherents was convicted of a breach of duty fancied that it was a point of honour to stand by him under fire. It has, and, even under so good a chief as Garfield it will continue to have, the inherent vices of all such organizations. Yet no one, we think, can have seen much of American politics without forming the opinion which we have already expressed, that, on the whole, the steady-going industry of the people, its sound morality, its intelligence, its respect for law, those qualities on which free institutions rest, are arrayed on the Republican side. The Toryism of the United States, perhaps, is to be found in the plutocratic element of the Democratic party, but the Conservatism, in the proper sense of the term, is Republican. "The right and authority of the people to govern themselves is accepted by all Americans. But there are two views of this authority; one is that it exists by the *will* of the people, and the other that it exists by virtue of its inherent rightfulness, accepted by the *convinced will* of the

people. I understand the two parties as they now exist, to represent the two ideas—the *Democrats* holding that the will of the people, or the majority of them, is absolute and should govern; while the Republicans hold that the will of the people is *without* authority, unless it acts through the orderly forms of the law." This is the reason given for his choice of a party by a Republican. He, no doubt, pictures to himself party as more completely identified with principle than in fact it ever is. Yet the will of the people, as will, is certainly rather the Democratic, while the will of the people, embodied in, and restrained by, law is rather the Republican, idea. The Democrats are zealous for the Constitution, which they declare to be in danger from Republican encroachment; but what they mean by the Constitution is not so much the maintenance of restrictions on the arbitrary action of popular will, as local freedom from national law. There can be no question as to the lawless character of their long reign in New York. The Republican party represents, so far as any party can, the sentiments and political temperament of Washington and Hamilton: it is the party of the Conservative Republic.

We have said that the issue between National Sovereignty and State Right does not seem to us in itself of great practical importance. What is of practical importance is the submission of the South to national control in its dealings with the emancipated slaves. White ascendancy has already been completely established, and the negroes have been entirely deprived, by force or fraud, of the franchise conferred on them by the nation, while their numbers are counted, without deduction, in the apportionment of representation. Still, while the National Government is Republican, Slavery cannot be legally or practically restored. Of its legal restoration there is no danger; but it may practically be restored in a great degree by abuse of the criminal law, and even by that absolute supremacy which the possession of power at Washington, as well as in the South itself, would give to the dominant race. Then there would be a revival of Southern society essentially as it was before the war; a re-

currence of its antagonism to the society based on Free Labour at the North; and a renewed danger of collision and civil strife. At present, disfranchised though the negro is, he feels the presence of a protecting, while the white feels the presence of a restraining, power. That feeling would depart on the fall of the Republican Government; for it is idle to suppose that a Democratic Government, sustained by the Southern vote, would do anything either to protect or to restrain.

Some Canadians seem to think that the Democratic party is the more friendly to England, and that it demands their sympathy on that account. The line which aristocratic society in England took at the time of the Civil War of course estranged the Unionists, who wrongly, though not unnaturally, identified the nation with the governing class; whence there was a temporary alliance with the South; though the South feels little gratitude for sympathy which lent it no effectual aid, but rather helped to lure it on to utter ruin. But the party of Washington and Hamilton is the really English party, and has always been at heart most friendly to the Mother Country; it suffered martyrdom in protesting against the war of 1812. Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic party, was a frantic enemy of England, and so were all his sect. These things, however, belong to the past: at present, apart from fishery disputes or mere rivalries of trade, there is no bitter feeling against England, except among the Irish, who are Democrats almost to a man. If a Republican on the stump speaks bitterly of England, it is in the hope of winning over Irish votes. English sentiment, therefore, would rather lead us to wish success to the Republicans; while, in a commercial point of view, as nobody doubts that we are affected by the prosperity and adversity of our neighbours, the party of Resumption and honest money is entitled to the benefit of our prayers.

—Unexpected strength has been shown by the Fusionists in Maine, and there are some who are so impressed by this as to

say that the Republican candidate has received his death-blow. But the victory, if it is one at all, seems to have been won almost as much by the Greenbackers as by the Democrats; and for the Presidency the Greenbackers have a candidate of their own. Tough as the ties of party are, and strangely as people in the United States are dragged by them into voting against their own manifest interest, it is hardly possible that commercial men and all who have an interest in commerce should not be repelled by the Greenback alliance: in this way the success of Fusionism in Maine may do the Democrats as much harm as good. Even apart from the fear of pronounced Greenbackism, Commerce is likely to recoil from the prospect of the general disturbance, by currency agitators, of the financial settlement which would almost certainly follow the advent of the Democrats to power. The desire of a change, which is natural, perhaps under the party system wholesome, and which Grant's two terms certainly did enough to justify, will be balanced by the fear of interrupting prosperity, which is just now flowing with a full tide. There may be reason to apprehend the secret hostility of the Third Termers, who must have been intensely embittered by their defeat, after a contest of extreme fury, at Chicago. The leaders are not likely to indulge their resentment, deep though it evidently is; they have lost much, but by a Democratic victory they would lose all; and they would rather keep the Pachalics of Pennsylvania and New York with abated grandeur, than be entirely stripped as well as discrowned. But some of the followers, having nothing solid to lose, may give free vent to their passion, and act upon the hint which was thrown out to them, after their overthrow at Chicago, that four years' Democratic rule would make the whole country long for the return of Grant. The break-up of the parties has commenced in the form of internal conflict between their sections; and partly in this way, partly by the progress of free thought, a good number of citizens have got loose from the trammels and form an independent element the decision of which will, perhaps, not be known before the election day.

—The power which is to rule the world has been holding festival at Boston, where the American Association for the Advancement of Science was received by the municipal authorities and the citizens, not only with the utmost liberality, but with the most delicate, assiduous, and judicious attention. "It is confidently rumoured that Professors Snore, Doze, and Wheezy have engaged three beds and a sitting-room at the Pig and Tinder-box." Our readers may recognise in these words a quotation from Dickens's "Report of the First Meeting of the Mudfog Association," which has been opportunely reprinted just as the "Mudfog Association" was holding its jubilee in England, and receiving the greetings of its American offset, in contemporaneous session, on that occasion. In the natal hour of the British Association, Dickens himself was not more derisive than the *Times*. With such strides has Science advanced towards Empire. Now, when a paper is announced "on the endocranium and maxillary suspensorium of the bee," not a risible muscle moves; all await with reverence the momentous communication.

A pæan of Evolution was sung by Professor G. F. Barker, in his address on "The Problem of Life." The solution of that problem the Professor, looking forth from his Evolutionary Pisgah, announced to be very near at hand. "The rapid march of recent organic synthesis makes it quite certain that every distinct chemical substance of the living body will ultimately be produced in the laboratory; and this from inorganic materials. Given only the exact constitution of a compound, and its synthesis follows. When, therefore, the chemist shall succeed in producing a mass constitutionally identical with protoplasmic albumen, there is every reason to expect that it will exhibit all the phenomena which characterize its life; and this equally, whether protoplasm be a single substance or a mixture of several closely-allied substances." "There is no essential difference between the protoplasmic life of the plant and that of the animal: hence the solution of the life question in the myxomycetes will solve the life problem for the highest vertebrate."

Nor could the sympathising hearer fail to draw the inference, whether the lecturer wished to suggest it or not, that, with the life problem, all other problems, moral, intellectual, and spiritual, would be solved also, and that "the highest vertebrate" was a full equivalent for humanity. It may be so, but the predictions of Science, like other predictions, must await the verdict of experiment. Let Professor Barker make a man, or even an oyster, and scepticism will bow before the evidence of fact. But even then, we shall not be able to admit that the rudiments of a being are the being itself; or that a description of its genesis is a full account of its nature and a limitation of its destiny. Every man was once an embryo; yet the man is not an embryo, but a man; and the case will not be changed if the protoplasmic life of Newton and Shakespeare can be identified with that of the myxomycetes. Nothing will have been proved except this, that the Author of our being works not by abrupt creation, but by gradual progress, in a manner analogous to human effort, the finished products of which are essentially different, if there is any such thing as essential difference, from their rudiments or raw materials; and this is as much implied in the saying of Genesis, that "God made man out of the dust of the earth," as it is in the scientific doctrine of Evolution. That which is called Evolution is only an observed succession of phases through which the being regularly moves in an ascending scale: what power causes and regulates the movement is just as much a mystery as ever; it would remain a mystery even though Professor Barker should succeed in producing life by chemical appliances, because he would be only the instrument; the power which endowed the chemical ingredients with the life-generating virtue would still be behind. If Evolution implies more than an observed succession of phases or stages of existence, if it implies a known cause of progression, it is a misleading and illegitimate term.

The great event of the meeting was the revelation by Mr. Graham Bell, the discoverer of the Telephone, of another grand invention in a similar line. Light has been proved capable

of producing sound, and messages are to be sent by a beam darted from a distance and received by the sensitive cells of Selenium, means being devised of controlling the beam. The fabled statue of Memnon is hardly a fable after all. No experiment was exhibited at the meeting, so that the holders of Telephone stock have still an opportunity of selling out; but the Professor and his coadjutor, in their private experiments, had spoken to each other to and from points two hundred and thirteen metres apart. If the Photophone succeeds it will mark another step in the development of a quasi-vital sensitiveness and communicativeness in the world of inorganic matter; and at the same time it will show that in science all things are connected and everything is useful. Little could Apollonius of Perga have guessed the practical use which modern science would make of Conic Sections; little could the Swedish chemist, Berzelius, when he toiled with the ardour of a lover, not to be chilled by repulse, over the mysterious sediment which at length yielded the new elementary substance Selenium, have guessed the practical use which American invention would make of his discovery. It is curious to see the wild enthusiasm and fantastic hopes which these triumphs of science are kindling. In Louisiana, the inventor of a mode of making man immortal by preventing the waste of tissue, is trying his process upon an old gentleman of ninety, who is considerately selected as not having much to lose. Another projector proposes to make the clouds discharge rain by sending up torpedoes in balloons—a power which will require regulation, since what would suit the projector's turnips might not suit his neighbour's grain.

The Anthropological Section was attended by a crowd which showed the keenness of the popular interest in these questions. But it was deluged with papers about the Indians. Real importance attaches to the tribal system of consanguinity: it is, so to speak, the protoplasm of society. But with Indian antiquities and mythology we confess, for our part, we are soon sated. They are both uninteresting and suspicious. An ex-

plorer of one of the mysterious mounds found in it, among other antiquities, a pin. The happy discoverer of a genuine Indian myth of the deluge was just going off with his treasure, when his informant, the venerable depository of the immemorial tradition, added that the name of the man who had survived the deluge was Noah. Of the myths recited, we could hardly recognise in one the character of a primitive conception as to the origin of the nation or of the world: they seemed to us either poor fairy tales, or stories which might have been derived from the missionaries. A tablet was exhibited from one of the mounds, the figure on which was plainly enough the Angel Standing in the Sun of the Book of Revelation, with one wing rudely converted into a spear, and the other into a shield. A self-made antiquary from the West brought a tablet which he affirmed to be ancient, and the hieroglyphic inscription on which, with the aid of grammars or vocabularies picked up at Chicago, he rendered into a sentence,—religious of course—and made up of three languages, Greek, Hebrew, and English, three marks in the form of *angles* denoting *angels*, while the whole was connected, after the manner of mare's nests, with Sun-worship and the Mythology of Egypt. This if more patent is not greater nonsense than a good deal of that which is being talked about the Pyramids. Proofs tendered of the coexistence of men with the hairy elephant appeared to us, like some of the Indian antiquities and myths, highly apocryphal. Those from Europe were drawings of nondescript animals, which we should have taken for the mere play of savage fancy, the elongation of the snout into an apparent trunk, which was the only elephantine feature, being no more portraiture than the rest. Those from our continent were two stone pipe heads, also representing nondescript animals, in which, again, there was nothing elephantine, except the elongation of the snout, forming an apparent trunk. In neither case was the end of the snout detached from the block, and in both cases it was, as we could not help thinking, not portraiture, nor even grotesqueness, but mere want of skill on the carver's part.

A lively debate arose as to the primitive form of government. The text was the well-known passage of Mr. Freeman, in which he identifies the popular assemblies of Uri and Appenzell, where all the freemen of the canton meet and vote in person, with primitive democracy. His position was impugned by the reader of the paper, on documentary and other grounds, as it seemed to us with considerable force. What was the primitive form of government was a serious question in the days of Filmer, when people believed not in Evolution, but in Devolution, and when the Primæval was not pithecoid but divine. Upholders of the Patriarchal theory are encountered by the serious objection that in the present day, of all the savage communities scattered over the world, which may be taken to be the representatives of the primæval state of things, not one is patriarchal. Consanguinity must clearly have been the germ of society, whether in the form of what we now deem a family and connect with patriarchal rule, or in some coarser and more animal form, is a debatable question; Filmer might have found that something in the way of Polyandry really occupied the historic shrine in which his fancy placed the Father of mankind. Kinship would broaden into the clan or tribe; but before anything that could be called political government, as distinguished from mere clanship, could arise, diversity of circumstances would produce a great variety of social conditions which would give birth to an equal variety of polities. In the struggle for existence weak clans would be crushed and broken; their *debris* would be annexed to the stronger clans, either as slaves, or as the dependants who appear in Roman history as clients; and thus an aristocracy of race would have its origin. War would exalt mighty chieftains into kings. In mountain-girt valleys, such as the Scottish glens, the isolation of the clan would be preserved with its brotherhood, its patriarchism, and its equality. On wide plains tribes would be fused, and empires would grow. Large migrations, requiring the conduct of a strong leader would probably have the same tendency. Maritime migrations, such as the enterprises of the Saxons and the

Danes, as they must necessarily have been undertaken by small bands, would substitute comradeship for kinship, encourage free councils, and the foundation of new communities in which the local tie, which is the rudiment of the political, would prevail over that of mere consanguinity. A universal prototype of political government is a chimera, and to search for it is to chase a shadow.

—In English politics the great event is the recovery of Mr. Gladstone which might be more than temporary if he knew how to take rest; but this is a part of greatness which nature has denied him, and it seems physically impossible that he should long upbear the burden laid on the shoulders of the Altas of the State, especially when to its ordinary weight are added the Eastern and Irish questions. His departure with no one to replace him would be certainly followed by the break-up of the Liberal party; the Whigs and Moderates flying apart from the Radicals; and the religious section from the Agnostics; and it is probable that the void would be filled for some time to come by a mixed ministry of Whigs and Conservatives, of which a prominent member, and possibly the chief, would be Lord Derby, who voted with the Government for the second reading of the Compensation Bill and whose counsels, inspired by the coolest and most enlightened class-interest, can hardly fail to commend themselves to the wisest men of his order.

—A resolution in favour of the abolition of the House of Lords, moved by a new Irish member at the fag end of a session, when the grouse season had begun, and at three o'clock in the morning, could not possibly lead to a serious debate or division. But though a young hound may overrun the scent, it does not follow that the scent will not lie. The "tremendous cheering" which greeted Mr. Foster's threat shows that the game is afoot;

and the formal explanation, which followed of course, that his utterance was personal not ministerial, in no way diminished the significance either of the speech or its reception. Mr. Forster remains a member of the Government. In the echoes which the speech has awakened on the Continent, especially in France, we perceive the unity of the European movement, which again renders the result in England much more certain than it would be were the English aristocracy and democracy left on a field of battle by themselves. What shape the project of Reform will take when the leaders have made up their minds, there is nothing at present to show; but if the hereditary principle falls, the institution falls with it: another Senate will never be constructed in face of the experience which is every day growing more decisive. Those who imagine, as some American writers seem to do, that the life of the House of Commons is bound up with that of the House of Lords, so that in putting an end to the existence of its rival the House of Commons would necessarily put an end to its own, must have curiously constitutional, not to say antiquarian, notions of political physiology. The House of Commons has actually lived and governed the country without a House of Lords; and, during that period, it showed at all events no diminution of vital energy. Conservatism will find itself constrained to become rational and employ the forces of the present, not those of a bygone, age.

In the great debate which is opening the history of the House of Lords, as well as its present doings, will no doubt be the theme of many a tongue and pen. In the case of a body whose pretensions are hereditary, the question of pedigree is not irrelevant. If the Lords claim to rule on the ground of their ancestral virtue and wisdom, it is reasonable to ask who were their ancestors. About half a dozen peerages really date from the Middle Ages, and connect the modern nobility of title and privilege with the feudal aristocracy which once furnished social as well as military leaders to the nation, and working in a way mentally narrow and little enlightened, yet

not wholly for selfish ends, extorted the Great Charter and rough-hewed the Constitution. The holder of one of these peerages, and the most ancient of them, illustrated the hereditary principle in the last generation by being convicted of cheating at cards. But the real root of the genealogical tree is the aristocracy of the Tudor epoch; new nobles, the sycophants of Henry VIII, by whom the spoils of the monasteries were flung to them, men gorged with public plunder, steeped in foul intrigue and judicial murders, the cruel and rapacious oppressors of the people, as well as the servile tools of the Court. Protestants, while Protestantism yielded booty, these Lords, upon the accession of Mary, sold the national religion to the Pope for a ratification of their title to the confiscated Church lands, while peasants and artisans went to the stake for their faith. By the early Stuarts, peerages were regularly sold to replenish the empty treasury, and the payments were unblushingly entered in the books of the Exchequer. A considerable addition was made to the stock of hereditary excellence by the concubinage of Charles II. Twelve peers were created at once to carry the shameful treaty of Utrecht, and it proves the corrupting influence of these titles, that of all to whom the Utrecht peerages were offered, only one was found to reject the dishonour. So, in 1831, when a wholesale creation of peers was in contemplation to swamp the majority against the Reform Bill, there was a crowd of applicants for what a high-minded man might have deemed a brand of ridicule. Under the House of Hanover titles became, with pensions, sinecures, bishoprics, contracts, and drafts on the Treasury, a regular portion of the bribery fund of party, to be earned like the rest by the proprietor of a rotten borough, who voted steadily with the Government. Chatham was universally felt to have lowered himself by accepting a peerage. "Lord North," as Mr. May says, "was liberal in the creation of peers, with a view to strengthen his own position as Minister, and to carry out the policyof the Court." Still out of some five hundred peerages, only ninety-eight can claim

an earlier creation than the reign of George III. The arch-manufacturer of the modern peerage was Pitt, who, "during the first five years of his administration created fifty peers and secured a safe majority." Within two years he created and promoted no less than thirty-five peers, and the sum total of his performances in this line was upwards of one hundred and forty. Nelson received the lowest grade in the peerage, while servility and corruption received the higher; there were a few other cases of creation for merit; but the great mass of the creations and promotions were payments for partizan votes, and in the case of the Irish Union, for votes not only partisan but infamous. Draw aside the veil of vague belief which shrouds spurious antiquity, and the idol is not one before which we can bow the knee. With regard to the legislative record of the House of Lords, harsh words would be out of place; its conduct has been that of a privileged order, which is necessarily the enemy of all change. It has resisted to the uttermost of its power, not only measures of political reform, such as the Parliamentary Reform Bill of 1831, but change of every kind, as directly or obliquely tending to the subversion of privilege. It threw out the *Habeas Corpus* Bill; it threw out the Bill for abolishing capital punishment in cases of petty theft; it threw out Catholic emancipation; it threw out the repeal of the paper tax, which has given England a cheap press. Its brightest epoch is the Revolution of 1688; but apart from any large-minded patriotism, it was deeply interested as a privileged order in the resistance to Stuart autocracy, and having expelled James II, it established, instead of a national government, an oligarchy to which history points as a paragon of political corruption. By its influence, in conjunction with that of the Crown, it plunged England into the American war, and again into that most fatal of all wars, the war against the French Republic, which was undertaken, almost avowedly, to save Privilege from the contagion of Equality. In 1867, once more threatened with an extension of the suffrage, and deeming direct resistance hopeless, it passed under the auspices of Lord

Derby, whose wires were pulled by his lieutenant, a measure which was a direct and undisguised appeal to the passions of the ignorant populace against the intelligent and respectable part of the industrial classes; a proceeding which only the largest allowance for the influence of corporate fear can prevent us from branding as treason to the State. The last act of the House of Lords, and of the party of which it is the centre, has been to goad the nation into a policy of aggression abroad in order to divert its mind from political progress at home. Of that impartial censorship of legislation, that wise revision of the rash acts of the Commons, which the Conservative fancy fondly ascribes to the House of Lords, there is no important instance in its history; if there is, let the instance be produced. Of such an agency of obstruction the immediate effect is the prevention of progress; the ultimate effect is revolution. An English statesman who was wise and a Conservative indeed, seeing that reform was inevitable, would try while he was yet in the way with it, to procure the adoption of more tenable securities for deliberate legislation, and the imposition of more rational checks on giddy change; he would tell the Lords frankly that nothing remained for them but to use all that was left of their influence in negotiating a good settlement, and smoothing the transition; but his counsels would no doubt be rejected by the temper of the order. Obsolete privilege never has known its hour.

—On the eve of the French Revolution the aristocratic party directed all its hostility against the Moderate Liberals: it was ready even to ally itself with the Jacobins against them. In the same way, though happily at a crisis of less peril, the aristocratic party in England directs all its hostility against Mr. Gladstone, and on the Irish question seems willing even to combine with the Home Rulers for the purpose of defeating his policy. The good harvest may soothe Ireland; otherwise there would be every prospect of an agrarian war, of which

the violent Tories of the English Parliament would share the blame. There are two movements; a political movement, of which it is impossible to define the objects, since it is led by men who do not know their own mind, and only wish to keep an agitation raging because agitation is their trade; and an agrarian movement, without leaders, but carried on by peasant farmers, who know their own minds perfectly well, and whose object, clearly enough, is to get rid of their landlords and pay no more rent. To deal with the agrarian movement is a matter of desperate difficulty, not because the Government could not put down armed resistance to the collection of rent, for it could do this with ease, but because wholesale eviction is impracticable. Under any circumstances, the task of the Government would be arduous; it becomes doubly so in face of Home Rule and Tory obstructionists acting in tacit concert. If the Irish only had a strong and honest leader, it might be possible to come to terms with him and effect a settlement with his aid. But, instead of a leader, there is merely a knot of agitators, full of anarchies, dissensions and rivalries among themselves, whose only common aim is to keep the pot of disturbance boiling. Of all the accidents of geography, the most calamitous is the Irish Channel: not the contiguity of the two countries, but their separation, is the thing to be deplored. An alien and absentee proprietary is the immediate source of these troubles. Yet now the absentees can hardly be expected to go into residence; to do so they must take their lives in their hands. Some Irish landlords have nobly done their duty; but they have too often suffered from the undiscriminating fury of peasant vengeance for the offences of their class. The savage suspicion, bred of estrangement and misery, has fiercely dashed aside even the hand of beneficence when it was held forth in the form of agricultural improvement. Meantime the value of Irish estates must be rapidly declining, and it seems possible that many of the landlords may soon be willing to settle the dispute by selling out on easy terms. There can scarcely be a doubt that pea-

sant proprietorship would be a change for the better: proprietorship, as France and Belgium prove, is the certain parent of zealous, almost over-zealous industry, of thrift, and of the prudence which prevents a redundancy of population. Thriftlessness, drunkenness, quarrelsomeness, superstition, reckless multiplication beyond the means of subsistence, it must always be remembered, are the vices of the Irish peasant, not of his landlord or the Government; but they were the vices of the French peasant under the old *régime;* and the Irish peasant gradually works out of them when his economical condition is changed. Of the farms in New England abandoned by emigrants to the West, many are taken up by Irishmen, who, as farmers, soon get rid of all vestiges of Donnybrook Fair. Unluckily, Ireland, from the moisture of the climate, is, for the most part, hardly a grain-raising country; certainly it cannot raise grain in competition with America; while, being without coal, it can have no manufactures. A large emigration will be as necessary as a change of land tenure. But the Irishman is not an Icelander, and Irish emigration will be apt to seek climates less severe than that of the North West. The Celt, moreover, is highly gregarious and prefers to settle with his kin in the environs of great cities. Of course the worshippers of force are ready at hand with their tirades against "constitutionalism" and their advice to do something violent, and as they think heroic. They who revel in these paper dragonnades are the weakest of sentimentalists, feeding their fancy with imaginary acts of vigour, as they indulge their passion for making a sensation by startling extravagance of immoral paradox. A really strong statesman knows that the violent is the reverse of the heroic, and that his power is shown by economy, not by prodigality, of force. Agrarian murder ought to be put down, for the sake, not only of its victims but of its perpetrators, who are steeping themselves and their race in barbarism by their atrocities; but to suspend liberty in Ireland, and let loose the Orangemen, which is the favourite policy of Mr. Froude, would be to merge the crimes of

the people in the crimes of the government. "Constitutionalism" that is righteousness, embodied in just and humane laws, has not been able to cure, as by magic, the accumulated evils of seven centuries in a few years; but there can be no question in the mind of any one who reads history and not novels as to its having wrought a great improvement, and ranged on the side of law and order sections of society which, half a century ago, were on the side of rebellion. Of this the impotence of Irish insurrection of late years, and the collapse of Fenianism, are proofs. Evil enough remains, but it is a legacy of the "unconstitutional," not the product of the "constitutional" *régime*. If the lash were to be used at all nobody would deserve it more richly than the would-be imitators of "Flogging Fitzgerald."

That the Irish question should be settled is as much to be desired for the sake of England as for that of Ireland herself. Home Rule obstruction, covertly seconded by the violent section of the Tory opposition, has largely contributed to the demoralization which has too evidently marked, in increasing measure the recent sessions of the British Parliament. In the last session allowance was to be made, as far as the government side of the House was concerned, for the multitude of new members eager to make themselves heard, for the sectional idiosyncracies and individual crotchets of a motley party, for the excitement and impatience of Progressists suddenly restored to power, for the personal disappointments which are always a source of trouble among the Liberals, while on the Conservative side there are not so many candidates for office, the squires being satisfied with the protection of their class interests. But the leader of the Opposition, Sir Stafford Northcote, evidently lost control of the extreme section of his followers. It would be a catastrophe indeed if the mother of Parliaments and the cynosure of Constitutional Europe should herself become disorganised and collapse. Yet something of the kind always impends over an assembly of which the organization

depends on party. Adherents of the Party system point to the evils which the break-up of Parties entails: but the evil lies really in a system which founds government on the assumed perpetuity of combinations, in their nature temporary and liable at any moment to be dissolved. Let the organic questions in which the parties originated be settled, or let independent opinion break through the trammels of party discipline, and the foundations of your government are gone.

For the last twenty years or more the extent of grain sown in England has been decreasing under the pressure of American competition, and of late the decrease has been very rapid. This cannot fail, by reducing rents and the income of the landowners, to work a great social, and ultimately a great political, change. The importation of food has been increasing with equal rapidity, notwithstanding the hard times. England, therefore, is becoming more than ever a country living on food brought from abroad; more than ever bound over to keep the peace; less than ever likely to enter into any commercial federation with the colonies which would require her to exclude American grain and meat. If Mr. Ashmead Bartlett's notice of motion respecting Imperial Federation points to anything of that kind, he may as well put it into his pocket. But the question presents itself, how long will this process of sending the workman his raw materials and his dinner across the Atlantic go on? Will it not some day occur to him and his employer that they may as well settle where the raw materials and the dinner are raised? Saving the coal, of which the mines are now growing very deep and the working very expensive, cotton-spinning England is an artificial structure, and everything artificial has its limit of existence.

—By the military genius of General Roberts, which appears to be of a high order, and by the valour and endurance of his soldiers, the disgrace of the Candahar disaster has been effaced and the honour of England has been redeemed, so far as arms

can redeem honour which had suffered a stain in doing injustice. It is to be hoped that this will close the scene, and that here is an end of carrying fire and sword into the homes of a gallant and unoffending race in quest of a scientific frontier. The advice of the great English soldiers and statesmen to let Afghanistan alone, and allow it to remain as a neutral zone between the British and the Russian Empires, having been twice tested by a ruinous experience, will be recognised as the rule of policy for the future. Russia evidently responds to the changed language of the English Government, and the wrangling between the two Powers is likely, so far as Central Asia is concerned, to end in their settling down each in its own sphere, where it will have enough, and more than enough, to do. It is now certain that the lively author of "Lucille" wanted to add a leaf to the chaplet of his renown by declaring war at once against Russia. He might, perhaps, plead that he was only going straight to the conclusion to which the policy of the Home Government logically pointed, and would ultimately have led. What a war with the Afghans and Russia together would have been, may be inferred from the fact that the war with the Afghans alone has cost a long period of anxiety and danger, two serious disasters, and twenty millions sterling. These are results which everybody must acknowledge. The moral consequences of aggression to the aggressor will not be so universally admitted. There are people who are very willing to show their love of God by putting Mr. Bradlaugh into the clock-tower; but whose "God" is a very obliging personage, satisfied with Parliamentary recognition, on which it seems he sets the highest value, but ready to take himself out of the way whenever you want to oppress or despoil your neighbour. There will, no doubt, still be swagger in Russian guard-rooms, and talk among Anglo-Indian alarmists about that singular hobgoblin "the will of Peter the Great," the current version of which is a product of French industry, manufactured by order of Napoleon I. Peter, if he can from his grave direct the Russian armies against the British Empire in India, must

have had the gift not only of posthumous despotism but of prophecy; for at the time of his death the British Empire in India did not exist. An autocrat who, by great effort and at immense expense, fixed the centre of his power on the Baltic, may be acquitted of any definite designs against Calcutta.

—Turkey as an Empire is defunct, though the Sultan retains a religious influence as the head of Islam, and is able in that character to sway, to some extent, the movements of the Mohammetans. The Powers have now to deal directly with populations, to which the Treaty of Berlin is an arrangement to which they were not parties, framed in a city of which they have never heard. Diplomacy is superseded by ethnology, geography and religious statistics, which amongst them must determine the boundaries and relations of the new communities to be formed in place of the Ottoman Empire. Those who are charged with the task are not to be envied; for the lines of race and locality are crossed in the most bewildering manner by those of religion, which, after a long suspension of political life, is stronger than nationality; while the whole process is rendered not only perplexing, but dangerous in the highest degree by the mutual jealousies of the mediating Powers. It may be taken as pretty certain that to the Greeks, or to use a more correct phrase the Greek-speaking race, will fall their ancient heritage, the Ægean, with its coasts and islands, Thessaly and Epirus. As to the northern part of Turkey in Europe the question is between the multiplication of independent principalities, perhaps in federal union, and an extension of the Austrian Empire to the East. Russia will probably favour the first plan, in the hope (the delusive hope, we suspect) that the principalities would be under her influence. Germany would favour the second plan, both from jealousy of Russia, and because it would certainly entail in the end the separation of the German provinces from the Austrian Empire and their union with the Fatherland. Hungary would be unwilling to see Austria

add to her Sclavonic element because the Sclav is the enemy of his oligarchical oppressor, the Magyar, and she would probably oppose that policy in the councils of the Austrian Empire. Albania has practically been almost independent since the time of Ali Pasha, and the Mahometan part of her population, a wild and warlike race, is giving most serious trouble, but will hardly count for much in the general result. That the Dardanelles will be opened may be taken for granted; Russia would be self-denying indeed if she failed to insist on it. But the Bosphorus is the water street of Constantinople, and the difficulty thence arising seems to be best met by the proposal to make that capital a Free City with a district, under the guarantee of the Powers. It would be absurd to allow this question to be regulated by Byzantine history and not by the practical relations and requirements of the present day. England, apart from sentiment, has the most manifest interest in strengthening Greece, and in making her friendship sure.

The decrepitude, thrice pitiable after the glorious beginnings of his reign, into which the Czar has fallen, only proves the more clearly what all cool-headed observers said at the time, that he personally desired, not the toils and anxieties of war, but the lap of ease; and that he was forced into war by the sympathy of his people with the oppressed Christians of Bulgaria. No fact, we believe, can be more certain, though those who believed it were set down as the dupes or the accomplices of Alexander's hypocritical ambition. It follows that had England loyally insisted with the other Powers on reform in Bulgaria, instead of whispering to the Turk that there should be no coercion and egging him on to resistance, war would have been avoided, and with it the peril to the peace of Europe with which the Eastern Question again teems. But if the world chooses to worship showy charlatanerie, it must pay the cost. Cyprus, as an acquisition, has proved worthless, as any one who had observed its commercial position and knew the capacity of its harbours might have foreseen; but as a piece of

plunder, it serves, by belying the disinterestedness of England, to destroy her moral authority both with the Porte and the other Powers.

—In France another Ministry has fallen, and its fall reveals once more the weakness of the party system. It is assumed by that system that every National Assembly is permanently divided into two parties, and two only, each party being united in itself on all questions of practical importance. But this is far from being the fact: it is the farther from being the fact the greater the activity of thought and the more independent opinion becomes. In the Italian Chamber there is a multiplicity of sections and sub-sections which makes it almost impossible to find a sufficiently broad basis for a Government. In the French Chamber there are, if not so many, yet many sectional divisions, and Ministers find it equally difficult to maintain themselves. De Freycinet is a hearty Republican; but he is disposed to moderation on the question of the Religious Associations; his moderation gives offence to the more thoroughgoing sections, and he falls. Nothing can be more injurious to the Republic than these rapid changes: they create that impression of instability which is the most fatal of all impressions, and most disposes the people to take refuge in the Empire. In time, and after calamitous experience, it will be seen that the administrative function is distinct from the legislative; that the administration does not need control over the action of the Legislature, but that it does need stability, and that to give it stability it must be elected not by a party, or a section of a party, but by the Legislature at large. This is the moral of Ministerial catastrophes in France. May it be understood soon enough to save the Republic from calamity!

A more ominous account has been given of De Freycinet's fall. It has been ascribed to Gambetta, whose wrath is said to have been kindled by the pacific speech which De Freycinet made to allay the disquietude caused by the disenterment of

Gambetta's Cherbourg letter. If this were true, serious events would be at hand, and, as we have before had occasion to remark, it is an unfortunate circumstance that Gambetta's political character was moulded, and his part, so to speak, cast, by the Franco-German war. Whatever his designs may be, he must soon take power in his own name; such a form of Government as an unavowed and irresponsible dictatorship cannot last for ever. Gambetta has hitherto had the great advantage of trying all policies at the risk of his nominees, without detriment to his own reputation. As in the matter of the Amnesty, he has been able to wait till the nominal Ministers had tested public opinion for his benefit, and public opinion having been declared, he has been able to take his line with success assured to him beforehand, and to come forward as the real exponent of the national will. It will presently be seen whether he can rule France without cat's paws and without a screen.

—In the paper to which we referred last month Principal Grant says, that in Canada with "astonishing religious zeal and clattering activity" there is little "theological scholarship and less speculation." He also says that Canadians, though political to excess, "calmly ignore fancy politics." Both statements are intended as compliments to the practical character of the people; but they amount in fact to this, that Canadians never rise to the consideration of great questions, religious or political, but are entirely taken up with mere party politics and mere sectarian religion. Be it favourable or unfavourable, the description, we think, would have been more applicable to our people twenty, or even ten years ago, than it is now; a vigorous race will in time show its vigour in all directions, speculative as well as practical; and to say nothing of politics, it seems to us that the great questions of religious philosophy are beginning to engage a good many Canadian minds. Among the latest proofs of this is Mr. Allen Pringle's "Ingersoll in Canada," a reply to Mr. Wendling, Archbishop

Lynch, BYSTANDER, and others. We do not know what the Archbishop will say to being coupled with BYSTANDER; probably he will lift his Archiepiscopal skirts pretty high; but we for our part must protest against being supposed to take our stand on orthodoxy, or to be affected by any of the arguments by which mere orthodoxy is confuted. We wish to take our stand on reason and truth, without excluding the possibility that reason and truth may be divine. It seems to us not unlikely that when the rush of exaggerative physicism caused by the recent triumphs of physical science is past, things may, after all, work out in a very different way from that in which extreme physicists assume that they will. In the meantime, we want the facts of religious development to be rightly stated and seriously considered, as well as those relating to the maxillary suspensorium of the bee. Col. Ingersoll's mode of dealing with Mosaism seems to us passionate, unscientific and misleading, to say nothing about the question of taste. Either he has not studied the philosophy of history, in which case he is hardly fitted to come forward as a teacher, or he chooses for the sake of platform effect to put out of sight what everybody who has studied the philosophy of history must know. The New Testament itself says that Moses gave the Jews some things because of the hardness of their hearts, that is, of course, not because of their wickedness, but because their moral development was imperfect. Orthodoxy itself, if it keeps terms with reason, allows that the method of divine dealing with man is that of gradual training, not of sudden advancement to perfection. Mosaism in its presentation of Deity, in its cosmogony, in its institutions, social, religious, political, military, domestic and juridical, belongs to the primitive and tribal state: to denounce and ridicule its primitive and tribal character is, in the eyes of well-informed and sensible critics, a mere platitude. The question is, whether we do not perceive in it, as compared with other primitive and tribal civilizations, an upward moral tendency, which renders it a memorable step in the progress of the race. We look in the Old Testament only for the begin-

nings of spiritual life; yet nobody can trace those beginnings in the twenty-ninth and the following Psalms, or in certain passages of the Prophets, without a feeling widely different from contempt. If the Old Testament were a mass of absurdities and immoralities, could it by any force of mere tradition have kept its hold on the reverence and affection of multitudes in the most highly civilized nations? Would the sacred books of any other primitive nation have done the same? If the Mosaic code and polity were on a level with those of other barbarous tribes, would men in the age and with the culture of the Puritans have imagined, however erroneously, that they were a divine ideal of government and law? Newton rested satisfied with the cosmogony of Genesis, which came into no decisive collision with his science: would he have rested satisfied with any other cosmogony that could be named? Say that a great deal of the Old Testament, especially the history of the tribal wars, belongs to the past, to the ages before humanity; say that those portions of it ought no more to be read in churches; and we shall heartily agree with you. But let us be true critics and do justice to the past.

Even as to those tribal wars and the exterminating precepts connected with them (which it is a comfort to think were probably speculative, having been penned when the wars were really over), they differ from their counterparts in the history of other tribes, not by special ferocity, but in having, not merely a territorial or predatory, but a moral object. The lawgiver wanted to save his people from contamination by the presence of an impure religion and a depraved morality; the Dorian invaders of Peloponnese, the Huns, the Danes, the Iroquois, had no such aim. Mosaism is the very reverse of favourable to militarism or to conquest. It is a remarkable attempt to give peaceful industry, embodied in a community of agricultural freeholders, a complete ascendency over war. It bids the people, of course, fight bravely in defence of their land, and enjoins the priests to encourage them in doing so, as in a world of rapine necessity required. But it does not exalt military

achievement or the military character as they were exalted by Greece and Rome: it ordains no triumphs or special rewards for the warrior; provides no military training. Much less does it—like the Koran—open heaven to those who fall in battle against the uncircumcised. It is opposed to monarchy, the military form of government, and if there is to be a king, forbids him to multiply horses, the almost indispensable instruments of conquest. It discourages the existence of a military profession by prescribing that the "captains of the armies" to lead the people shall be chosen only when the people are actually in the field. It almost absolutely precludes wars of mere ambition when it prohibits forced service, by which the great armies of eastern conquerors were raised. He that has built a new house, he that has planted a new vineyard, and the newly-married man, are to be exempted altogether; but besides these, every one that is "fearful and faint-hearted" is to be allowed to return to his home. What conqueror could act under such conditions? Pythius, a wealthy Phrygian, according to Herodotus, having promised Xerxes a vast contribution towards the expense of his expedition against Greece, ventured to pray that of his four sons one might be left at home as the prop of his declining years. The King's reply to the prayer was an order for the immediate execution of the young man, whose body was cut in two and impaled half on one side of the road by which the army marched, half on the other side. The keynote of Jewish history is not military or territorial greatness, but righteousness, which is identified with loyal obedience to Jehovah.

We might deal with other points of comparative civilization or morality in the same way. The Avenger of Blood is an institution universal in the tribal state before the introduction of regular justice: but the Mosaic law limits the privileges of the avenger to cases of wilful murder; it forbids the blood feud, ordaining that the fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither the children for the fathers, but every man for his own sin: it also forbids the blood fine or money compensation for blood, inculcating with a unique clearness the sanctity

of human life, and declaring that murder shall be punished with death. The right of asylum is universal, but the Mosaic law restrains its abuses, by limiting the number of cities of refuge and confining the privilege to cases of unintentional homicide; he who commits a murder with *malice prepense* is to be taken from the altar that he may die. The absolute power of the father over his children was universal; but while a Roman father might put his son to death privately, of which there was a case under the Empire, the Hebrew father is required to bring his rebellious son before the elders in the gate of the city, and the concurrence of the mother, who would be sure to be on the side of mercy, is required. The ordeal was universal, but the Mosaic law confines it to one case, the water of jealousy, which seems to be more a device for allaying domestic suspicion than a superstitious mode of trial. Sacrifices are universal, but there are no human sacrifices in the Mosaic ritual. Expiatory offerings for national sin are universal, but among the Hebrews the offering was a goat, among the Athenians it was a man. Slavery is universal, but of all slave-codes, ancient or modern, the Hebrew is the mildest; its tendency is to do away with slavery altogether, and in Hebrew history there is no trace of servile insurrection or discontent. Hereditary priesthood is common, but the Levites are prevented from becoming a caste by being consecrated in the general assembly, and by the laying on of the hands of the whole people. Laws of war in the tribal state hardly existed, no common bond of humanity being known; but the Hebrew is enjoined to summon a city regularly before attacking it, not to destroy the fruit trees, which the Greek always destroyed, and to show at least some tenderness for the sorrows of the captive women. All tribes think themselves the chosen people of their tribal deity, but in place of legends of national pride, the Hebrews were taught that a Syrian ready to perish was their father, that they had been brought out of bondage by a God who executed the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and that they were to love the stranger, for they had been strangers in the land of Egypt. Finally, the character

of the tribal deity was such, and such his worship, that in the best and most spiritual part of the nation they passed naturally, though not without a crisis, into universal Fatherhood and a religion of Humanity.

We said that if no reality corresponded to the idea of Deity it would be difficult to account for the existence of the idea. Mr. Pringle replies that the difficulty is no greater than it is with regard to the idea of Fairies or of the Devil. Fairies are merely local creatures of the imagination, without any sort of root in our moral nature. As to the Devil with horns and hoofs, he also is a creature of the imagination, and may go with the anthropomorphic conceptions of the Deity. But moral evil and the perpetual conflict of our higher tendencies with it are ideas which have a root in our moral nature, and for which, as well as for the idea of Deity, it seems to us difficult to account without supposing some corresponding reality.

The idea of Deity lurks where Mr. Pringle would least suspect it. Mr. Spencer himself in one of the opening chapters of his "First Principles," after combating and rejecting the Theistic hypothesis in its ordinary forms, falls back upon the Unknowable as the background and basis of our existence. "By continually seeking," he says, "to know and being continually thrown back with a deepened conviction of the impossibility of knowing, we may keep alive the consciousness that it is alike our highest wisdom and our highest duty to regard that through which all things exist as the Unknowable." In this and subsequent passages he evidently looks upon the Unknowable as an object of reverence, otherwise it would hardly be our highest duty to regard it as that through which all things exist, or to maintain any particular attitude towards it. But Unknowableness in itself excites no reverence: we do not venerate an insoluble problem or a fact which is irrecoverably lost: and the same may be said of anything material, even though it be supposed infinite and eternal. Nothing excites our reverence but a Person, or at least a Moral Being. There lingers in Mr. Spencer's mind the belief that the present limit of our knowledge is the veil of Deity.

THE BYSTANDER.

NOVEMBER, 1880.

NO one can doubt that Sir John Macdonald is a skilful negotiator, or that he has done his best in the Pacific Railway negotiation; the people therefore have every reason for giving a candid consideration to the result of his efforts. Nor can it be imagined that the Prime Minister really intends to deprive the country of perfect freedom of deliberation, whatever light expressions he may have used in the flush of triumph. Taking a land grant of twenty-five millions of acres, well situated, at the lowest assignable value, this, added to a subsidy of twenty-five millions of dollars, and roads already constructed at a cost of thirty-one millions, would make up something like a hundred and twenty millions of public money. A hundred and twenty millions of dollars compared with the aggregate wealth of Canada, are fully as much as ten times the sum would be compared with the aggregate wealth of England. What English Minister would dream of dealing with such a sum as two hundred and forty millions sterling of his own authority, or even by the mere vote of his party majority, without the full concurrence of the nation? There are some to whom speaking of the concurrence of the nation seems treason against the omnipotence of Parliament. They are afraid that we shall lapse into a system of plebiscites. But Parliament is elected on the issue which happens to be before the country at the time of the election; the present Parliament was elected on the issue of the National

Policy, and is the practical outcome of a plebiscite, if any one likes to use the term, upon that question. Suppose another great issue happens to present itself between elections, why should not the nation have an opportunity of forming and expressing an opinion on this, as well as on the subject of the National Policy? It might be less necessary to stickle for freedom of national discussion, if Parliament were really what it is supposed to be—a perfect representation of the community, deliberating independently on all questions. But it is a very imperfect representation of those who do not attend party conventions; and, instead of its deliberations being independent, if the majority gives any signs of independence, it is at once taken into caucus, and brought back to discipline by arguments and inducements which do not even come to the knowledge of the public. The upholders of the treaty with British Columbia and of the construction of military railroads, have without doubt, good reason for deprecating plebiscites. They would hardly have obtained a plebiscite for their policy. The members of the Syndicate themselves must see that, if they contract, not only for the construction, but for the running of the road, their relation with the Government is likely to survive the present Ministry; and that this relation may prove uneasy, unless the consent of the country to the bargain shall have been deliberately given, so that the nation may feel itself morally as well as legally bound by the agreement.

The Pacific Railway enterprise, though commonly treated as one, is made up of three portions, each calling for separate consideration—the Prairie section, the Mountain section, and the section north of Lake Superior—while the entire road forms the western wing of a line of Imperial communication between the provinces destined to be welded into a North American Empire, of which the eastern wing is the Intercolonial. As to the Prairie section, there is no difference of opinion, supposing the road to be rightly laid out for commercial purposes; a query suggested by the fact that other than commercial objects have been mainly in view. The Mountain section has been designa-

ted as productive and unproductive by the same writers in the same breath, as the changeful exigencies of party battle required. To make it productive there must either be a preternatural multiplication of British Columbians, a discovery of some extraordinary source of wealth in their territory, or a vast development of trade with Asia; but it is a necessary link in the line connecting ocean with ocean, and essential to the execution of the treaty with British Columbia. The section to the north of Lake Superior is pronounced by all independent judges, and tacitly admitted by the Government itself, which has shrunk from putting that section under contract, to be an undertaking, unless we strike gold, commercially unprofitable, not to say insane. It is not essential to Inter-oceanic communication, which may be effected, so as to fulfil all the commercial objects of the treaty with British Columbia by means of the Pacific Junction and Sault Ste. Marie lines. It is essential to nothing except the political and military objects which demand a line carried exclusively over Canadian ground. No one will deny that political and military objects may be sufficient to justify a large expenditure; hardly any sum would be too large to spend in securing against attack the great ports and arsenals of England, or in bringing Ireland, if it were possible, practically nearer to her partner's side and more within the reach of assimilating forces. But our people ought to be satisfied, before they are committed to a vast outlay, that the political and military objects are sufficient in the present case, and not only that they are sufficient, but that they will be certainly attained. The Intercolonial Railroad, after costing thirty-six millions, is pronounced by the military authorities useless for its military purpose, and it is likely to become equally so for political and all other purposes so soon as the natural route shall have been opened from St. John to Montreal through Maine, an event not far distant, though the work is at present suspended, as we understand, on account of negotiations for the purchase of a link. Is it certain that a more satisfactory result would attend the construction of the line to the north of Lake Supe-

rior, that it would really render the country unassailable by superior forces from the South, or that it would effectually separate, and for ever hold apart, the two nations which, socially, commercially, and in every respect but government, are blending with each other before our eyes ?

It would appear that, at all events, there can be no objection to completing the productive portion of the undertaking first, that it may, if possible, supply money for those which are unproductive. The fund, out of which the Prime Minister hopes that we shall be completely recouped, is the prairie land. But this land, be it never so fruitful, will be worth no more than so much sea or ice till it has been opened up and peopled. To open it up there will be needed not one railway only, but a system of railways, for the whole of which it has first to pay. The immigration has this year fallen greatly short of the calculations, and it evidently appears, through the haze of rhetoric, that the country has its repulsive features as well as its attractions for the settler. It may be assumed also that the land made over to the company will be sold faster than that retained by the Government, because the company will push the sale with a spirit and a lavishness of preliminary outlay which no Government can rival. When the net profits of the Government land come in, the first charge on them ought to be the repayment to the nation of the money sunk in the Intercolonial, which, as we have said, is the eastern portion of the Imperial line. When that claim has been satisfied, or the means of satisfying it have been secured, the produce of the land sales will be available for another gigantic enterprise of the same kind. The transfer of the undertaking to a company, though unspeakably desirable as an escape from mismanagement and corruption, does not diminish the cost to the country; nor is there any reason why the different portions of the work, and the appropriations to each of them, should not be kept distinct, as they would have been had the work remained in the hands of the nation.

—The failure of the immigration into Manitoba to realize sanguine expectations is clearly not to be ascribed to the Land Regulations alone. There are bitter complaints, from disappointed immigrants, of the climate and of the nature of the country which, it is said, being a dead level, is without drainage, so that when the snow melts the water either is absorbed by the earth or lies in pools, breeding "Red River fever," till it is dried up by the sun. These accounts are, no doubt, coloured by the personal misfortunes of the narrator and relate only to a portion of the country. They are, however, reproduced in the English papers, and their appearance there is a practical answer to the attack which Sir John Macdonald, by no means in his happiest mood, made upon Mr. Blake for giving people a dark picture of the North-west. Whatever Mr. Blake might have said, or refrained from saying, the less favourable version of the facts would be sure to find its way to those who had an interest in knowing it. English capitalists are not so silly as to be satisfied with official descriptions, or with the representations of a vendor; when an immense sum of money was to be risked, they would take care to inquire for themselves. Supposing Mr. Blake not to have spoken for a party purpose, but to have been convinced (as he well might be) of the truth of what he said, he did his duty to Canada in saying it. Puffing is weak as well as despicable, and no men have done more injury to Canadian credit in England by their own acts than some of our most vociferous puffers. We ought at once to discard the notion that our public men owe us anything, or can do us good by anything, but sincere advice. The councils of free nations are necessarily open, and the risk of revealing weak points to the world must be run; as a rule it amounts practically to almost nothing. Sir John Macdonald and his friends never abstained from criticizing Grit finance from fear of producing a bad impression on the foreign money market. The statesman is a patriot who tells the truth, however unfavourable it may be. He is the traitor who tells us lies.

—Seldom has any country been summoned to deliberate upon an enterprise so vast in comparison with its resources, or so vitally connected with its fundamental policy. The mere outlay, though immense, is really the least part of the matter. What is truly momentous, and makes this a turning point in our destiny, is the choice which our people are now called upon to make between the continental and the anti-continental system, between the policy of antagonism to our neighbours on the south and that of partnership. Here the roads divide. Never was it more needful that the vision of a nation should be unclouded by prejudice or passion. It is certain that the view of Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues on the general question of international relations, is the opposite of that which we should wish to prevail; therefore we are as far as possible from deprecating honest criticism of their policy. But where can be the use of vilifying and slandering them, of treating them as one would hardly treat common rogues in the Penitentiary, and accusing them perpetually of theft and lying? With their great majority they are really masters of the situation. What can be more absurd than to irritate their temper, to render them callous to argument, and to make it impossible for them to yield a single point without injury to their self-respect? It would surely be difficult for a political party to be worse served than the Canadian Opposition has been served on the present occasion by its reputed organ, the *Globe*. The situation of the Opposition leaders was delicate. Either from conviction or, what is more likely, out of deference to conventional opinion, they had adopted the enterprise in its entirety, including the unprofitable as well as the profitable parts of the road, and had become as thoroughly responsible for its success as those by whom it was originally set on foot. They were bound therefore, to further, at least not to impede, it in the hands of their successors; and when Sir John Macdonald went to England to make arrangements for its completion, duty and policy alike prescribed to them scrupulous forbearance from anything like antagonism till the result of the negotiations should have

been made known. Only by such forbearance could they have preserved their authority with the nation and their right to a hearing for their criticisms when the proper time arrived. Instead of this their organ presented them as mad with factious malevolence, passionately desiring the failure of the operation, agonized by any favourable intelligence, hailing any adverse report, however frivolous, as a crumb of comfort. Since the positive announcement of the Prime Minister's success, they have been exhibited as seeking consolation day by day in wretched eavesdroppings from Ottawa about hitches in the negotiations, which were the mere creatures of a malevolent fancy. On the question of the road itself, two or three different positions have been taken up in the course of as many months, and each in turn has been maintained with the vituperative and slanderous violence which, when the time for falling back arrives, adds emphasis and disgrace to the retreat. The game of the Opposition has thus been ruined, and the leaders will go to Ottawa without a shred of moral authority left. Had the object of the organ been to bring disaster on the new leadership, it could not have laboured with more success. The finishing stroke is put to the work by the attacks upon Sir Charles Tupper, stamped as they are in every line with the mark of personal malice added to party hatred. If public justice requires that Sir Charles Tupper be arraigned, arraigned let him be, in the manner and in the language befitting anything so grave as a charge of peculation or personal corruption against a man in an office of the highest trust. But any one, even the most fanatical Grit, can see that it is not regard for public justice which inspires venomous invective. Supposing the person accused to have done anything needing concealment, he could devise no more effectual veil for his offence than that which has been thrown over it by the *Globe*. Generous sympathy for a man run down by malice is a feeling of which the conductors of that journal have had no personal experience, and of the influence of which on the public they can form no idea; but Sir Charles Tupper, whatever may be his demerits, is now in

the eyes of the mass of his fellow citizens an injured man. On evidence which only the blindest of partizans can think complete, he has not only been pronounced undoubtedly guilty of public theft, but loaded with the foulest abuse; for these self-appointed censors feel themselves at liberty to combine the functions of a judge with the oratorical freedom of an Old Bailey advocate. If the same accusation is brought forward by the chief of the *Globe's* party at Ottawa, it will hardly obtain a hearing, because there will be a universal unwillingness to sacrifice any one to the paltry vengeance of the *Globe*. The practical moral is that if the Opposition leaders wish to attract men of sense and character, Liberals above all, to their standard, and to have their cause decently presented to the public intelligence, they will find it necessary to reform their press. While the party system endures there must be party journals, on the conduct of which the popular estimate of the party will, in great measure depend; and leaders whose organ during the eight months of Parliamentary vacation has been identifying them with everything that is narrowest in faction and everything that is meanest in malignity, will find it no easy matter to set themselves right when Parliament meets. Mr, Mackenzie, as we know, deems the conduct of the *Globe* a model of "righteousness and beneficence," and he has perhaps good reasons for his individual opinion; but we expect now to see not the spirit of Mr. Mackenzie, but that of Mr. Blake prevail.

The subject is important to the Opposition and to the Opposition alone. A Montreal journal said the other day that the transfer of the *Globe* from the Brown family to a commercial proprietary (which we may observe, by the way, does not include Mr. George Stephen), would be a great event for Ontario. But Ontario is no longer a one-journal Province. To the energy and growing independence which, within the last ten years, have created or improved the Toronto *Mail* and *Evening Telegram*, the London *Advertiser*, and many of our local journals, we owe what we may safely call a final liberation from the tyranny which for many years was unscrupulously and ruthlessly exer-

cised, not only over opinion, but over personal character. In what hands the *Globe* may be, is a question which fortunately becomes every day of less moment to the public.

—It has been proclaimed that the Duke of Argyll is coming over to inquire into the truth of the sad stories set afloat by wicked persons about the prevalence of annexation sentiment among Canadians. Of course the report is a canard. His Grace has sense enough to know that the last man to hear the truth on such a subject would be a Duke. Another reason for his saving his passage money is that no such stories have in fact been set afloat. Canadians are settling on the other side of the line by tens of thousands; economical and social forces of all kinds are working towards a fusion; non-political organizations of all sorts, religious, social and commercial ignore the political division; the Anglo-Saxon race upon this continent is gradually becoming one in every respect except political allegiance: this has been said, and it neither has been nor can be denied. It has also been said that a feeling in favour of removing the customs line is gaining ground. But nothing has been said about the prevalence of annexation tendencies among the Canadian people, nor has anybody advocated annexation. Moreover, if the Duke were to inquire in the quarter from which the stories are supposed specially to proceed, he would find there a perfect consciousness of the fact that it is most unwise and unstatesmanlike to think of a change in the relations of any communities unless all adverse sentiment is extinct.

—The late Minister of Finance has been holding forth on a large scale and with his usual ability. He pounded the National Policy, but he forgot to tell us what he would have done to fill the deficit. The new taxes appear to have just filled it; so that the character of the tariff as one of revenue, in other words of sheer necessity, except in regard to the single article

of the coal tax, has been vindicated. Sir Richard Cartwright will gain an easy victory over his opponents if they maintain that a country can be made prosperous by increased taxation; but they will gain as easy a victory over him if he contends that it matters nothing whether a fiscal system is or is not adjusted to the special interests of the country. He can hardly assert with confidence that his own financial policy was successful; and he must surely have begun to suspect that both his budget and his party suffered by his inflexible determination to treat mere rules of expediency as inviolable principles and refusal to consider the actual circumstances of the case before him. He dwells, with a melancholy not unmixed, upon the exodus, the numbers of which he says amounted to ninety thousand last year, and are likely in the current year to be still larger. But it is obviously a mistake to call the exodus a flight from Protection, the American tariff being far more Protectionist than ours. The truth is, it is not a flight from anything, nor properly speaking, an exodus at all. It is simply the natural set of the current of population from the less wealthy to the wealthier parts of that which economically is the same country. A Canadian in quest of employment or wanting to better his condition goes south, as a New Englander goes west, or as a Scotchman or a man from a rural district of England goes to the manufacturing cities or London. The phenomenon is not extraordinary but normal, though it happens at the present time to have reached unusually large dimensions, owing no doubt to the coincidence of depression in some of our Provinces with a revival of prosperity in the States. Perhaps a third cause is the heavy weight of mortgage debt pressing on the owners of Canadian farms. This is likely to prove a subject of increasing anxiety, and if the Loan Societies do not take care, they will soon have half the country on their hands.

—An article in our August number, discussing the Pacific Railway Commission and similar Commissions of Inquiry, contained

the passage "With all due deference to Mr. Alpheus Todd, be it said, no Royal Commission can be allowed to meddle with any question which belongs to Parliament as the grand inquest of the nation, especially when Parliament is already seized of the inquiry." Just too late, unfortunately, for notice in our last number, came a letter from Mr. Alpheus Todd, expressing his surprise at this mention of his name, inasmuch as far from approving the appointment of the Commission to inquire into the truth of Mr. Huntington's charges in 1873, he had written a memorandum objecting to it in the most decided terms. The subject being historical, we give the letter *in extenso* below.* We

* OTTAWA, 23 Sept., 1880.

PUBLISHER OF "THE BYSTANDER."

SIR: In Sept., 1873, at the request of the Governor-General, I furnished him with a detailed memorandum, in reference to the issue of a Royal Commission to investigate the charges preferred by Mr. Huntington, M.P., in his place in the House of Commons, against the Ministers of the Crown in Canada, of granting a charter to the Pacific Railway Company for alleged corrupt considerations.

After a careful review of the question, in the light of constitutional precedents I gave it as my opinion "that the issue of a Royal Commission to inquire into the charges contained in Mr. Huntington's motion was precipitate and objectionable; that the Committee of Inquiry appointed by the House of Commons to consider these charges, instead of abandoning the duty assigned to them, because of their inability to administer an oath to witnesses, should have reported the case to the House for further instructions; and that the Government should then have proposed to the House, either to proceed with the investigation upon unsworn testimony, or else to pass *an Act* appointing certain persons, *named therein*, to be Commissioners for the purpose of investigating the complaint, whose report should have been duly submitted to both branches of the Legislature.

"By either of these courses, the inquisitorial functions of the House of Commons, in the initiation and control of all complaints against Ministers of the Crown for malfeasance in office, would have been duly respected, and the ends of justice effectually attained, without derogation to the constitutional rights of Parliament."

This memorandum, although in the first instance regarded as confidential, was afterwards shown to the two leaders in Parliament, Sir John Macdonald and the Hon. Edward Blake.

It was likewise perused by Mr. Justice Gowan, who was the principal member of the Royal Commission in question, and from his remarks at the time to myself I am under the impression that it contributed not a little to the course taken by the Commission itself; for, as I have stated in my last published volume (p. 445), "this Commission reported evidence taken before them, but properly refrained from pronouncing judicially thereon, lest their judgment might seem to be to the prejudice of further inquiry by a Parliamentary tribunal."

Under these circumstances, you may imagine my surprise on reading in the last

most gladly correct our error, and rejoice to find that we have Mr. Todd's authority on our side. But we submit that any one who, in ignorance of the fact now disclosed, should read the passage of Mr. Todd's work on "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies," relating to the Pacific Railway Scandal (pp, 444-8), would fall into the same misapprehension. "Various methods," says Mr. Todd in that passage, "had been proposed to determine the truth of the complaint against Ministers, but technical difficulties presented themselves, which provoked delay. At length, by the advice of Ministers, a Royal Commission was appointed to pursue the investigation, cut short by the failure of the Parliamentary Committee. This Commission reported evidence taken before them, but properly refrained from pronouncing judicially thereon, lest their judgment might seem to be to the prejudice of further inquiry by a Parliamentary tribunal." Not a hint of disapprobation anywhere. The conduct of the Governor-General throughout the whole affair is lauded to the skies, without exception or qualification. "Lord Dufferin remained firm in his adherence to constitutional order; while active in his endeavours, by every lawful proceeding, to prove or disprove the accuracy of the allegations, he steadily refused so long as they were unsubstantiated, to withdraw his confidence from his responsible advisers." The phrase "every lawful proceeding," manifestly includes the appointment of the Commission. Again, "We are chiefly concerned with the conduct of Lord Dufferin during this trying time. * * * The honour of his Ministers and the credit of the country were at stake, and it behooved him to be satisfied that none but men of honour and personal integrity should fill the

---

number of THE BYSTANDER (p. 476), the assumption that I had justified, or was prepared to justify, a "Royal Commission" being "allowed to meddle with any question which belongs to Parliament as the grand inquest of the nation, especially when Parliament is already seized of the inquiry."

As I am at a loss to conceive upon what grounds I have been credited with such opinions, I can only state the facts above mentioned, and request that I may be set right in the next issue of the magazine.

Yours, &c.,

ALPHEUS TODD.

place of his constitutional advisers, and should wield the authority of the Crown. But he would not hastily assume corruption until it should be found to exist. He, therefore, resolved, in the first instance, to leave to Parliament to ascertain the truth or error of the charges, before he pronounced judgment on the question. And when the Parliamentary inquiry temporarily failed upon technical grounds, he promoted and encouraged immediate investigation by means of a Royal Commission, not with intent to withdraw the case from the ultimate cognizance and control of the House of Commons, but to enable him to obtain from his Ministers in open court those explanations in regard to their conduct which circumstances had rendered necessary, and upon which he had a right to insist." It was a sense of delicacy, probably, that restrained Mr. Todd from saying that the measure which the Governor-General promoted and encouraged was "precipitate and objectionable," and that the proper course was to leave the inquiry to be carried on by the House of Commons; but the result is, we must repeat, that Mr. Todd's readers are inevitably misled.

The present Pacific Railway Commission, with regard to which the discussion arose, has, so far as appears, been honestly doing the duty assigned to it: at all events, it has not shrunk from exposing partizans of the Government. But there is the gravest objection on principle to the employment of any such tribunal. The Commission is not engaged in collecting information for legislative or administrative purposes, which is the proper function of Royal Commissions. It is investigating offences, and offences of a deep dye. At the same time, it has no power to deal with the offenders, who, with their crimes upon their heads, stalk forth into the community, to the great detriment of public morals. A Commission to inquire into the truth of a charge against a Government appointed by the accused Government itself, such as that against which Mr. Todd wrote his memorandum, is a palpable absurdity. We want, what we shall never get, a regular tribunal for the investigation and punishment of corruption and other political of-

fences. Parliament itself, while the party system lasts, will not be fit to undertake the task. What happened in the case of the Pacific Scandal? Evidence of a crime was obtained by means the use of which nothing could warrant but the imperative demands of public justice. The trial was opened, but it inevitably degenerated into a faction fight, and as soon as the spoils had changed hands the interests of public justice were laid aside and the trial was at an end. If Parliament could delegate its powers as a Grand Inquest to some judicial body, as it does in the case of contested elections, there would be hope of bringing corruption and jobbery to justice.

—The *Newmarket Era*, a Reform journal, deprecates the transfer of the gaol management from County and City Councils to Local Governments. "We must enter our protest," it says, "against these continual encroachments upon the liberties of the people—this ceaseless effort to centralize power in the hands of the executive authorities. During the last decade the entire patronage of the licensing system has been diverted from the people by being removed from municipal control and placed in the hands of the Administration of the day. Division Court Clerks and Bailiffs have also been made subject to their mandates. County Attorneys, under their authority, can authorize the disbursement of the people's money, raised by direct taxation, from the county treasury, and other patronage, formerly controlled by municipal councils, is now dispensed by the Administration of the day. These encroachments have been gradual, but they have been none the less sure." The patronage of the licensing system is as dangerous an engine as was ever put into the hands of a Government, and testimony comes to us from all sides, shewing that the consequences are precisely what might have been expected; but for this the responsibility rests mainly on our Prohibitionist friends, who, in their eagerness to enforce a special article of morality, forget the larger interests of political freedom. There can be no doubt,

however, as to the existence of the general tendency denounced by the Editor of the *Newmarket Era*; and we would only ask him and other men of independent mind to direct their attention to the real root of the mischief, which lies deeper than any personal propensities of the present Ministers. Here again we see the consequence of intruding the party system of government into a sphere where no real reason for a party division exists. What organic question or permanent difference of principle is there in connection with the local affairs of this Province on which parties can be based? Absolutely none; and the consequence is that the system breaks down; there is nothing to sustain a parliamentary opposition; practically the opposition ceases to exist, but the majority remains bound by its party allegiance to the Ministers, who are thus left practically unchecked. The upshot is the installation in power, apparently for life, of a clique which naturally strives to aggrandize itself and entrench itself more securely in office by appropriating all the patronage and all the means of influence within its reach. Nothing is more irresponsible than a party government when the opposition has collapsed: the responsibility is borne by the majority, while the majority is under ministerial control. At the same time we have all the evils of party government. Men who are not followers of the Ministers are excluded from the service of the Province, however useful they may be capable of making themselves to the community in their own line. The entrance to the Local Legislature is closed against all but partizans. In making the higher appointments, the pitch-fork system, that fell necessity of party cabinets, prevails. Each office must be filled by a member of the clique, whether there happens to be one qualified for it or not; though the consequence to the public may be the dislocation of some great administrative machine. In the present instance there is, moreover, a political compact with a religious body than which nothing can be more opposed to all that is sound in politics and pure in religion. In Provincial legislation, at all events, everybody must admit that partyism

is absurd. Provincial affairs ought to be managed on the same business principles as those of a commercial corporation, and the officers ought to be appointed as those of a commercial corporation are, solely with a view to their practical usefulness. It will be said that to advocate the change is hopeless; very likely it is so, for a system resting on patronage is almost as inexpugnable as a system resting on bayonets; but it is as well to know where the root of the evil really lies: reformers will, at all events, be prevented from wasting their breath in protests against effects when the cause has not been removed. In the Provincial Legislature of Manitoba they are actually getting on at the present time without parties. We are told that some of the Manitobans want party to be introduced as a security against corruption. If any one fancies that faction is an antidote to corruption, let him look across the Line.

— At length the staff of Toronto University is complete, and it is needless to bespeak a cordial reception for gentlemen who bring with them the highest testimonials of their merit, and who are in no way responsible for anything that may have been done amiss by the Government. At the same time, it is impossible to deny that the Government has done some things amiss, and given the Professorial staff real reason for complaint. The manner of the proceeding was unfortunate, to say nothing of the substance, and evinced little desire to consult the feelings of those whose hearty co-operation is as essential to the success of the institution as the character of any single appointment. To the very last, matters seemed to go wrong. Why should the Provincial Secretary, if he wanted a report on the appointments, have applied to the new President of the University, who was not responsible for them, and who is thus placed, at the outset of his administration, in seeming opposition to his staff?

—While Toronto University is thus suffering under the hands of the politicians, the energetic Principal of Queen's College, Kingston, opens his new buildings with imposing pomp, and with high promise of a prosperous future. He is manacled, so far as his Professorships are concerned, by the Westminster Confession, but admission to his college is free, and his own largeness of mind may be trusted to make the liberty real. From political influences he enjoys an exemption. Private benefactors of education will feel an interest in his college, such as they never feel in an institution connected with Government. In the race between his University and the University of Toronto, he will have some advantages; and he is sure to turn them to the best account. In one respect, we confess, his success moves in us rather pensive feelings, inasmuch as it seems to drive the last nail into the coffin of University Consolidation. Languor and incapacity call Consolidation utopian, as they call everything that requires effort and ability. Six or eight years ago it was feasible, as well as most desirable, had the question fallen into the right hands. Now the opportunity has gone by. Ontario will never have a great University, and it is too probable that those who want a first-rate training, either general or in any special department, such as practical science, will find their way to the great Universities of Europe, or of the United States. A cry is raised against the importation of Professors. How are Professors to be trained, except at great seats of learning and science, furnished with all the necessary apparatus, and kept on a level with the latest improvements? Many, no doubt, will always be lured by the bait of a degree to be easily obtained, as they would be lured by a cheap ornament of any kind; but a wise parent will know that to send his son to a University unprovided with adequate means of high teaching is mere waste of time and money, with the danger of dissipation to boot. Practical science is a prime necessity with Canadians. But where in Canada is it to be had? How is the great sum requisite for the maintenance of a proper staff, laboratory, museum, and apparatus, to be provided, when

the resources of a Province containing less than two millions of inhabitants are scattered over half a dozen Universities? The Hon. Alexander Morris, in a letter to the *Mail*, suggests that though we cannot have a Provincial, we may have a Dominion University. There might be an Examining Board for the Dominion, and degrees granted by it, would, no doubt, have a higher value than those granted by Local Universities; but for a Dominion University, as a place of learning and education, a large endowment, as well as legal powers, would be required.

In a gracefully-written address, the new Chancellor of Queen's University, Mr. Sandford Fleming, advocated the abolition of Greek and Latin as compulsory studies, on the ground of their diminished importance since the growth of modern literature and science. The same plea has been often urged before, and on the same ground; it has been seconded by men themselves eminent for classical attainments, and the concession is being gradually made, Greek and Latin being already on the footing of optional studies in some Universities. But as optional studies, the classics, to a wonderful extent, hold their ground. They have lost nothing of their pre-eminence as a school of taste; on the contrary, their value has been enhanced by the progress of æsthetics; and Mr. Fleming's suggestion that translations would do as well will be endorsed by no one who is acquainted with the originals; for as the plaster cast of a statue to the masterpiece itself, so is the best of translations to the ancient author. The classics have also gained importance, with the progress of philosophy, historical and general, as excellent text-books for the study of humanity. Their paganism, at which Mr. Fleming glances, secures their neutrality, and as they are not used in teaching us theology, they interfere with no one's faith. Mr. Fleming is apparently willing to strike literature and philosophy out of education altogether, and to be content with science which, he says, leads us to contemplate the perfect works of God, while literature and philosophy lead us to contemplate the imperfect works of man; but he might be answered in the spirit of his own remark by reminding him that the moral and

intellectual nature of man is the noblest work of God. The "highest vertebrate" view of humanity cannot yet be accepted as the rule of education.

—It seems that at Toronto University the Co-education movement has come to a crisis. We cannot attempt to discuss the subject in all its bearings here; but we would remind those on whom the responsibility rests that there are three distinct questions:—Ought women to receive a higher education than they receive at present? Ought they to receive the same education as men? Ought they to receive it in the same place with men? The first and even the second questions may be decided in the affirmative without settling the third, in which are involved moral and social considerations which it is the fashion to treat with levity, but which, as the experience of Europe, in the matter of female student life, shows, ought not to be so treated. If expediency is opposed to the change, there can be no plea for it on the ground of right; neither sex can have a right to use a public institution if the institution would be injured by such use; women have no more right to force themselves into a male university than men have to force themselves into a female college. For our own part, we avow a mistrust of the movement as part of a general attempt to efface the line which the hand of nature has traced between the sexes, and to turn woman from the partner into the competitor of man. We are of the number of those who believe that the sphere of woman's usefulness and happiness, and therefore of her dignity, is domestic, not public or professional, life; that her guiding star is affection not ambition. Instead of giving us better wives and mothers, Co-education, we suspect, would prevent a good many women from becoming wives or mothers at all; the movement is, to no small extent, a revolt against what women have been persuaded to consider the slavish burden of matrimony and maternity; while men, let them pay lip homage to prevailing sentiment as they may, will practically

seek in marriage, not a "co-partnership," as Miss Anthony calls it, with a rival intellect, but the fireside happiness of union with a genuine woman. The barriers of artificial privilege ought to fall; the landmarks of nature will not be easily removed. At all events we may be allowed to wish success to the Ontario Ladies' College, and other institutions of the same kind, the aim of which is to give women a high yet womanly education in a womanly way. Nor are we sure that the future has not a reward in store for the administrators of any male university who may decline to yield to the current of prevailing sentiment, and to change the character of their institution while it is doing good work in its own line. After all a current may be heady, yet not deep, and the real feeling of the community may be the other way: such in fact is the experience of certain institutions on the other side of the line which have rushed into Co-education. We should be sorry to be bigoted or illiberal in this or in any other matter; but the hand which is laid on the mutual relations of the sexes is laid on the keystone of human happiness; and whatever is done ought to be done with a full view of the consequences, not under the impulse of vague sentiment or individual ambition.

—There is joy over the large number of Matriculations at the Universities this Fall. It would seem ungracious not to join in applauding the thirst of youth for knowledge. Yet we cannot help repeating the warning that the intellectual callings are overstocked, and that the tendency to flock into them is one of the social dangers of the day. Nor can anyone who knows Universities doubt that for all but the really industrious and steadfastly moral, University life is a period of great peril, to say nothing of the expense: no discipline can be exercised by University authorities anything like so effective as that which is practically exercised over a young man regularly attending his place of business and living under his father's roof. People talk about sowing wild oats; but sowers of wild

oats, like other sowers, reap what they sow. A false idea of superior dignity attaches to intellectual callings; the dignity of all honourable callings is the same, and all, with the reading facilities which we now have, are compatible with a certain amount of general knowledge and literary culture. Nothing can be less dignified than the position of a University graduate who can find no suitable employment. As to happiness its indispensable conditions are independence and the power of supporting a wife and family at a reasonably early age. Let a father measure well not only the tastes and talents of his son but the youth's active sense of duty and power of self-control before he takes him from commercial life and launches him into a career, which, if it proves unfortunate, will lead to the misery which is the portion of ambition and sensitiveness in want of bread.

—If the interest of England in British Canada has been re-awakened, as Sir John Macdonald boasts, so has that of France in French Canada, and the manifestation of the feeling in both cases is much the same. It assumes the shape of increased alacrity in investing. France has taken the last Quebec loan, founded companies for growing beet sugar in Canada (as to which, however, we fear our misgivings are proving correct), and sent delegates to her old colony to survey it as a field for the employment of capital. But she has also displayed her maternal love in a less commercial way by crowning the Canadian, M. Frechette, Poet Laureate. "The good old France," said M. Frechette, at the banquet given at Montreal in his honour, "after a great many years of oblivion, has officially recognised us as her children." A celebration of the old connection less agreeable to British feelings, are the annual religious services, which were once more performed the other day, in honour of victories gained by the French Canadians over the British before the conquest. This re-union of the French Colony with its Mother Country can hardly fail, we fear, to

intensify French feeling in Quebec, to render the fusion of the French with the British element in the Dominion more difficult, and to remove to a greater distance than ever the hope of a Legislative Union. On the other hand, it may bring about an important change in the character of French Canada itself, which has hitherto remained a relic, preserved in ice, of the France before the Revolution, with the same patois, the same ignorance, the same piety or superstition, call it which you will, the same social ideas and tendencies; the only difference being that the power which in old France was divided among king, aristocracy and priesthood is, in Quebec, engrossed by the priesthood, or only occasionaly shared by the notary. But the France to whose bosom her daughter now turns is the France of the Revolution and the Republic; and through the channel of communication thus opened Revolutionary and Republican ideas will flow. There will be an end of the fossil simplicity of Quebec. The Jesuit, with his Ultramontanism, assailing the Gallican religion of the liegemen of Louis XIV. in Canada, was the first to disturb the repose of isolated antiquity. It is now likely to be disturbed from a very different quarter, and with much more serious effects. M. Frechette himself is a Liberal, and is treated with coldness by the Conservatives of his race; his coronation may prove symbolical of the opening of a new era in Quebec.

—In the Presidential contest victory still hovers between the two armies, but she seems inclined to perch on the Republican standard. The State elections in Indiana and Ohio are not decisive, because Hancock may be, and we suspect is, personally more popular than the local candidates; but they are highly significant, and their moral effect on both parties is plainly visible. It would not be surprising if those who dread above all things a disputed election should now, seeing the Republican side the stronger, throw their weight into that scale, in order to make the result desisive. The national mind seems to

be moving pretty much on the line traced in our last number. Of the "bloody shirt" feeling against the South there has been no sign; anything like an appeal to vindictive feeling has fallen dead; but there has been a strong recoil from the danger of sudden change and confusion, to which the Republic would be exposed if the Government were handed over to the South with its Irish, Tammany and Greenback allies. "The election of a Democratic president at the present time," says the *American*, a new weekly journal, to which we have to thank the *Globe* for calling our attention, "would not, it is true, endanger so much of our recent history as has been embodied in amendments to the Constitution, but nearly everything else would be liable to be called in question. Mr. Blackburn, of Kentucky, the candidate of a large number of his colleagues for the Speakership of the House, made a threat of a wholesale repeal of Republican legislation, and while his threat excited a just alarm in many quarters, it was not repudiated by his party as involving any breach of political morals. Hence the dread felt by the whole business community of a change in the Administration at the present time, and hence also the sensitiveness of the stock and other markets, as often as signs occurred which seemed to point to the election of Mr. Hancock." The dread of the revolution which would follow if the South were to vault into supreme power is at least as much commercial as philanthropic. As we surmised, the Maine elections, instead of being a death blow to the Republican cause, have proved a warning bell summoning the legions of commerce to arms against soft money. No doubt Mr. Bayard, Mr. Tilden, and other Democratic leaders are sensible and patriotic men who would not wish to do, and perhaps would try to prevent, mischief; but they would be impelled by the Democratic mass. Secession itself was at last the act of the multitude rather than of the leaders, who lost control over the passions which for mere personal purposes they had aroused. Barriers against Secessionist claims set up by Constitutional Amendments, of course, could not be thrown down; but there is no-

thing chimerical in the apprehension that a raid might be made on the Federal Treasury in the way of indirect indemnity to Secessionists. Under the Constitution of the State of New York State aid could not be directly given to religious institutions, yet aid was indirectly given to religious institutions belonging to the Roman Catholic allies of the Democratic party. As to the Tariff issue, our impressions have been verified: the Democratic candidate has thrown over Free Trade rather than risk the loss of the Protectionist wing of his party. That rather narrow, not to say sordid, ground for desiring to see the Republic under the rule of the Ex-slaveowners and Tammany no longer exists. Whichever issue of this contest is best for the United States themselves must ultimately be best for the whole Continent; and it is best for the United States that victory should remain with the sounder elements, which, on the whole, are those comprised in the Republican party. We say it without a particle of fanatical feeling on the Southern question. We look only at the actual condition and prevailing tendencies of the two political sections. Nor would our sympathies be what they are, if the purer section of the Republican party had not triumphed over the Bosses and Third Termers at Chicago. As to the commercial relations of Canada with the United States, we do not believe that the results of the election will make much difference either way. Partial Reciprocity has broken down, and both parties, if we mistake not, are well inclined towards Commercial Union. What the manufacturers on the Republican side want is not Protection against Canada, but Protection against Europe. They would regard the inclusion of Canada in the fiscal line as an additional safeguard.

Whatever doubt there may be as to the results of the struggle, there surely is none as to its immediate effects. The country is plunged into all the turmoil and bitterness of an unarmed civil war. The commonwealth is divided into two hostile camps; rancorous and anti-social passions are excited; the moral atmosphere is darkened with calumny;

bribery and corruption, with all their fatal effects on national character, are rife on both sides; commerce quakes; business is interrupted; a legion of roughs is poured into Indiana, and for some days that State is in peril of a murderous affray. To all this will be added, if the Democrats win, the division of the spoils, and a complete change of the whole administration of the State down to the lowest postmaster for the purpose of paying the services of a vast horde of political buccaneers. There are those who actually profess to desire a Democratic victory in order that the youth of the country may be treated to a practical demonstration of the evils of the Spoils System. Our critics are greatly mistaken if they think that we stand alone or are showing extraordinary "Radicalism" in desiring a simplification of the American Constitution, with a view both to the avoidance of these deadly conflicts with their attendant perils, and to the diminution of the swarm of mercenary politicians which is bred under the present system by the mass of patronage, the number of paid places in legislatures, and the continual recurrence of elections. In the United States the thoughts of numbers of good citizens, and men as far as possible from being Radicals in a bad sense, are tending in the same direction.

—A contemporary, the other day, referring to our opinion that the United States would be better with a single Chamber, cited a dictum of the *Pall Mall Gazette* to the effect that though a community of the ordinary kind might get on either with a single Chamber or with two, in the case of a Federation there must be two, one to represent the national principle, the other to represent the federal. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, under its new editorship, is so high an authority that we are glad to be able to oppose to it, not our own feeble reasonings, but historic fact. The Dutch Confederation had no such second Chamber; nor had the Achæan League, for the Great Council, we may be sure from analogy, was not a second Assembly, with a more federal charac-

ter, but a select body preparing measures for the assembly at large: these with the Swiss Confederation and the United States are the four great federations of history. But the United States are not a federation in the proper sense of the term. A federation, in the proper sense of the term, is a group of commonwealths united for the maintenance of internal peace and for mutual defence, but otherwise retaining their independent existence. The United States are a nation with a quasi-federal structure. The political parties which really rule the country are national: they extend through all the States and through both Houses. The Republican and Democratic Senators act and vote with the Congressmen of the party on the same principles and for the same objects; in no important instance, so far as we are aware, in the whole of American history, can the Senate and the House of Representatives be said to have been opposed to each other as the organs respectively of Federalism and Nationality. When the South seceded, the Southern Congressmen moved in perfect concert with the Senators. Switzerland, in like manner, since 1848, has been not a federation proper, but a nation with a quasi-federal structure. She was in fact at that date remodelled partly in imitation of the American Constitution. When she was a real federation she had a single assembly. We may add that in Switzerland the Legislature elects the Executive Council precisely in the method which, when propounded by us, has been pronounced utterly impracticable. Our own Confedation has virtually but one Chamber, since power centres entirely in the House of Commons; nor has the Senate ever given special expression to the Federal idea. The system of two Chambers, in the case of the United States as elsewhere, is, as we are convinced, an imitation, founded on misconception, of the British House of Lords, which is not a Second Chamber or Senate, but one of the Estates of a feudal realm.

— At the time of our going to press the Dulcigno question remains in a state of ludicrous unsettlement. Jealous of each

other the Powers are, to an extent which will probably be fatal to their further co-operation, even in the execution of the Treaty of Berlin. But having once appeared before Dulcigno they can hardly allow themselves to be foiled and covered with ridicule by the half-crazy Sultan and the eunuchs of Constantinople. English Toryism, however, is excited by the hope of successful resistance on the part of the Turk, and hoists the flag of Non-intervention, on which it has itself been gloriously trampling for the last six years. That England had better look to Ireland and other things needing attention at home, than expend her energies on distant objects of ambition, is a doctrine which has been preached often enough by Liberals, who have been called cowards and peace-mongers for their pains. Launched by the Tory Government into the Eastern imbroglio, the country has now only to choose between the policy of Lord Beaconsfield and that of Canning, between the selfish policy of repressing rising nationalities and the generous policy of emancipation. The Jingo Liberal Mr. Cowen denounces the annexation of the mixed population of Dulcigno to the Christian state of Montenegro; yet he had no objection to thrusting the Christian and Slavonic population of Bulgaria back under the dominion of its Ottoman oppressors. It goes to the heart of a Liberal to do violence to the inclinations of people even so few in number, and so little civilized, as the Mahometans of Dulcigno; but the cession is in pursuance of the Treaty of Berlin; war is commonly followed by the transfer of territory; territory would have been transferred had the Turks succeeded in their invasion of Montenegro; and that there was a war was the fault not of the Gladstone Government, but of that which at the time of the Conference of Constantinople encouraged the Turk to resist instead of honestly pressing on him, in conjunction with the other Powers, the reforms in Bulgaria which were demanded alike by his own interest and that of humanity. The bill for Vivian Grey's fireworks is now being paid, and it is long.

This paltry question between Montenegro and Albania being

settled, there will come the far greater question between Turkey and Greece. As to the final result there can be no doubt: as sure as was the advent of German Unity and of Italian independence so sure is the resurrection of the Greek race; so surely will it recover its ancient domain—the coasts and islands of the Ægean sea. The dead Empire of the Ottoman will go to its grave, a living nation will take its place. But how destiny will give effect to her decree is still a mystery, and it will be interesting to watch the revelation. If the little kingdom of Greece single-handed were to attack Turkey at present, it would most likely be torn by the fangs of the dying tiger. Russia will not help, for the extension of the Greek power would be the most effective curb to her ambition, if she meditates aggrandizement in that quarter. Mr. Gladstone sympathizes as ardently with Greek as he did with Italian independence; but environed as he is with desperate difficulties at home and abroad he can hardly think of giving effect to his sympathies with arms. It is something, however, to know that British influence, so far as it is exerted, will be exerted for noble objects, and on the principle, as sound and wise as it is generous, that what is best for humanity is best for England.

— All the powers of evil seem now to be abroad in Ireland. Orangeism as well as Ribbonism is up. The Irish peasants have once more, by murders and other savagery, disgraced their race and sullied their cause in the eye of the civilized world. It is impossible to use language too strong of the conduct of Mr. Parnell and his fellow agitators, who, by speaking with levity, and almost with sympathy, of these crimes, have encouraged the peasantry to commit them. On the other hand it is quite true that the crime is solely agrarian; and that in the districts where it has been most rife, even in Tipperary itself, ordinary offences have been very rare. Justice requires us also to remember the training which the Irish, as a nation, have had, and of which the traces are still left upon their character. The

French, when taxed with the dreadful deeds of the Revolution, may plead that they had been taught cruelty by butcherly wars, by wholesale executions of wretches whom famine had driven to revolt, by a penal system of which torture and breaking on the wheel were familiar portions, by sanguinary persecutions, by the exhibition on the part of the aristocracy, on all occasions, of a most insolent recklessness of plebeian life. The Irish are entitled to the benefit of a similar plea, though in a less measure, as they have had more time to learn humanity. In 1798 they were goaded into open rebellion by the wholesale flogging, half-hanging, pitch-capping and picketing which were carried on over a large district by the yeomanry and militiamen, who, as soon as the suffering masses began to heave with disaffection, were launched upon the homes of the peasantry. When the rising came, of course it was like a rising of galley slaves who had broken their chains. What then ensued we learn from the letters of Lord Cornwallis, who, having commanded against rebellion in America, was not likely to be too sparing of the blood of rebels. After stating that the Irish insurrection is declining and dwelling on the horrors of martial law administered by passion and revenge, he proceeds to say that "all this is trifling compared to the numberless murders that are hourly committed by our people without any process or examination whatever. The yeomanry are in the style of the Loyalists in America [we commend that phrase to the notice of Dr. Ryerson], only much more numerous and powerful, and ten times more ferocious. These men have served their country, but they now take the lead in rapine and murder. The Irish militia, with few officers, and those chiefly of the worst kind, follow closely on the heels of the yeomanry in murder and every kind of atrocity; and the fencibles take a share, although much behind hand with the others. The conversation of the principal persons of the country all tends to encourage this system of blood, and the conversation even at my table, where, you will suppose, I do all I can to prevent it, always turns on hanging, shooting, and burning, &c.; and if a priest has been put to death, the

greatest joy is expressed by the whole company." These scenes and their train of consequences the hysterical worshippers of force are apparently willing to renew. The Government happily has not forgotten that it is the organ of a moral civilization: it is preparing to protect life and property by legal means while it matures a remedy for the evil. If the existing law fails, it may be supplemented to the necessary extent without doing any violence to principle. But we hardly expect that it will fail, because the righteous policy which has been pursued towards Ireland by the Liberal party during the last half century, beginning with Catholic Emancipation, and ending with Disestablishment and Tenant Right, has ranged large and powerful classes, once disaffected, on the side of law and order. Repression, even legal repression, is uncongenial and unwelcome work to Liberals; but they need not shrink from it so long as their feet are on the path of right. They are the liegemen of liberty and justice, not of anarchy and assassination.

What the remedial measure for Irish agrarianism should be is a question the decision of which will be no enviable task, more especially as the Liberal Government, in any attempt to effect a compromise between the warring interests, will certainly be thwarted and embarrassed by the landowning House of Lords. Buying up the interest of the landlords out of the public purse, and selling it to the tenants, would be perilous work, because, unless the tenant purchased, which many might be unable to do, the State would have to collect the rent, and another agitation would probably break out. The most absurd plan of all is that of Mr. Parnell, who proposes that the payment of rent, at a fair valuation, shall continue for thirty-five years, and then cease. What rent is "fair," we suppose, he expects to be settled by revelation from Heaven. His plan would happily combine the turpitude and violence of confiscation with the denial of the relief immediately required.

As wild theories about land are abroad, and as in this electric age an idea once started is apt to go round the world, it is well distinctly to specify and localize the justification for extra-

ordinary action in the case of Ireland. The justification is that the Irish landlords have for centuries been, and still to a large extent are, absentees; that, as a body, they are not only absentees, but aliens; that they are not only aliens, but heirs of a conquest and a confiscation, the memory of which has never entirely died in the minds of the people, or given place to the idea of legal and friendly relations. The present landlords, it is true, are largely suffering for the sins of their ancestors; but this does not make it easier for a Government, not despotic, to serve evictions on a whole people. That property in land is, under ordinary circumstances, more justly liable to confiscation and plunder than any other kind of property is a fancy bred by the agrarian struggles of the Old World. For every product of human industry, as well as a cultivated farm, nature has furnished the raw materials and supplied spontaneous forces; in every product of human industry are really accumulated the labours of many workers besides the owner; and as to saying that all the people of an old country have a right to live on the land, there would be as much sense in saying that twenty men had a right to make a meal off the same penny loaf.

Let no well-wisher of Ireland, American, or of whatever country he may be, say a word to encourage insurrection. It is utterly hopeless. A single brigade would scatter it to the winds. Not only would all parties in England at once unite to put it down, but they would have with them, if not the majority, the strongest section, as has repeatedly been proved, of the inhabitants of Ireland itself. In the end of the last century Irish insurrection was backed by the French Revolution; since that time it has always ended at once in miserable failure. Great Britain cannot afford to have Ireland an independent and hostile nation on her flank: she would put forth if necessary, her whole power, and she would inevitably prevail. The hope of Irish nationality, if it has a hope, lies in co-operation with that party in England which has just fought the battle of morality against Jingoism and conquered, which holds

that righteousness is better than aggrandizement, which has already obtained much for Ireland, and may yet obtain more, even in the direction of enlarged self-government. To sympathize with the aspirations of an Irish nationalist is easy, or rather not to do so is for a Liberal impossible; but to spur him on to his doom is not the part of a true friend.

—Even in Norway, among the pines and waterfalls, and beside those still fiords in which infant navigation dipped its oar political disturbance is on foot. It is not for want of liberty Norway is as democratic a country as any in the world. She has completely abolished aristocracy, apparently without any bad effect: the legislative power is entirely vested in the National Assembly, elected on a broad basis, and the king has only a suspensive veto. The trouble arises out of the federal relation of Norway to Sweden, which is recent and the offspring, not of spontaneous attraction, but of the military forces which broke up and recast old Europe in the early part of the century, and were themselves set in action by the French Revolution. Before that time Norway had been connected not with Sweden but with Denmark; while, at the former period the three Scandinavian kingdoms were bound together for a century and a quarter by the union of Calmar. A revival of the union of Calmar has been the dream of modern Scandinavians; it is a dream which ethnology and history encourage, and on which geography puts no veto, for the Sound, which in the hands of a Scandinavian union would be the key of the Baltic, might be deemed rather a bond of connection than a dividing gulf. But Denmark is a prolongation of the German plains; she is the seaboard of Germany; and her ultimate destiny can hardly be doubtful. In the meantime Sweden and Norway are illustrating the difficulties which attend a federation of two, in which the greater country is sure to be always troubled by the suspicions and irritable jealousy of the lesser. It would appear that the only sound basis for federation is a

large group of states, in which no single state preponderates. Even in these cases much has been due to the consolidating influence of a common struggle for life, such as those of the Swiss Cantons against Austria and Burgundy, that of the American Colonies against England, that of the Achæan League against Macedon and Rome, and that of the Dutch Provinces against Spain. Those who undertook, the other day, to create a Federal Union in South Africa, had certainly not studied the conditions of their problem; it may be doubted whether the framers of our own Confederation had. That Ontario pays three-fifths of the expenditure of the Dominion is at once a pregnant and an ominous fact. Another thing which the dispute between Norway and Sweden exemplifies is the difficulty of carrying on Constitutional government with two Parliaments under one crown. In the case of Ireland and England, for which the Repealers propose the same arrangement, the difficulty would amount to an impossibility, as utter disaster would soon prove. The two Parliaments, instinct with the disruptive forces to which they would owe their separate existence, could not fail to become hostile to each other. They might, and almost certainly would, take different lines on questions of foreign policy, on questions of peace and war; and as supreme power under the Constitutional system is really vested in Parliament, the monarchy being a figure-head, there would be no conceivable means of controlling the divergence. The Catholic Parliament of Ireland would certainly repeal the Act excluding Catholics from succession to the Crown. Before the legislative union of Ireland with England, the Irish Parliament was kept in harmony with that of England by organized corruption; and the relations between England and Scotland were as uneasy and as full of danger as possible till the Union of the Crowns gave place to the legislative union. Legislative union and entire separation are the alternatives between which Great Britain and Ireland have to choose, though legislative union is compatible with the concession of a very large amount of self-

government, the controlling authority of the supreme legislature in all questions being reserved.

—Nihilism has puzzled us and we have been afraid to touch it. Not that there could be any doubt as to the class of phenomena to which it belonged. Some time ago a beautiful and sumptuous country house, full of first-rate works of art, was burned to the ground under circumstances which pointed to incendiarism. The incendiary was not discovered, but suspicion fell upon a workman who had been employed in repairs, and whose character, upon inquiry, afforded ground for the belief that he might have done the deed merely out of envy and malice, his evil nature being stirred by the spectacle of the magnificence and refinement which he did not share. Add to this man's temperament a little wild philosophy, of the Pessimistic type, or a dash of Materialistic Socialism and you have a Nihilist. In the strange case of incendiarism at Gatineau the other day the main ingredient of Nihilism again appears. A great movement is going on among the suffering and malcontent classes throughout Europe and even in the United States; for Kearneyism is the mitigated counterpart of French Communism, Spanish Intransigentism, German Socialism, and Russian Nihilism. A succession of such movements may be traced in history, usually in connection with some general upheaval of society which gave vent to the imprisoned elements of combustion. In the troubled decline of the Roman Republic, there was the terrible insurrection of the slaves known as the Servile war. The break-up of the Roman Empire was marked by a rising of the oppressed peasantry in Gaul under the name of Bagandæ. The risings of the serfs called Pastoureaux in the thirteenth century had partly a religious character, and were connected with the ferment of opinion produced by the Crusades. In the decline of Feudalism came the more fearful risings of the serfs, the Jacquerie in France, the rebellion of Wat Tyler in England. The Jacquerie was the mere

offspring of suffering and despair; but in the rebellion of Wat Tyler we see the force of religious enthusiasm and social utopianism mingling with those of economical disturbance. Among the leaders are Wycliffite preachers, and they are social levellers as well as evangelical reformers. The religious element becomes more predominant as well as wilder in its form, in the rising of the Anabaptists. In our day the place of religious enthusiasm is taken by Materialistic Science, which, in the different countries, blends in varying proportions with Socialistic aspirations and political revolution; religious enthusiasm now giving birth only to Mormonism, which has its best recruiting ground among the Calvinistic Methodists of Wales. Atheism, as the denial of everything above the world of sense or beyond the present life, is the pervading spirit of the present movement. If people fancied that such beliefs as the existence of a Deity, the divine authority of conscience and future compensation or retribution, would depart without leaving a void, they may see proofs of the contrary in this social crisis. The chief seats, however, of the disturbance have been the abodes of the suffering and envenomed proletariat, of which the Faubourg St. Antoine was the most hideous, but which present themselves in the great cities of all the old countries. Now Russia is too young to have a proletariat of this kind; and though there is a certain amount of dissatisfaction and restlessness among the lately emancipated serfs, the Russian peasant is neither revolutionary nor intellectually active enough to be a Nihilist. Even of the artisans, a great number are still peasants, going to the towns for temporary employment, but returning to their country homes. The name itself shows that the party must belong to a class above the lowest, for it is clearly derived from the Hegelian philosophy. Who and what are the Nihilists? The most precise answer to this question that we have seen is given by Arnaudo, an Italian writer on the subject, who enumerates several elements of a sort of middle class proletariat of the excluded and the disappointed. Alexander II., in his golden prime, emancipated the serfs; but

he shrunk from abolishing the privileges of the nobles, who engross the higher employments, civil and military, and whom he was unwilling to make his deadly enemies by depriving them of their official monopoly as well as of their slaves. The first malcontents, it seems, were the students belonging to the three divisions of the middle classes, the burghers, the merchants, and the priests, who, after completing their course, found the gate of public employment closed against them, and soon overcrowded the new intellectual callings, legal and literary, which had been opened by reform. Hundreds of malcontents, says Arnaudo, were thrown upon the street by each set of university examinations, and among these Nihilism took its rise. Members of the lower nobility, ruined by the loss of their serfs, swelled the ranks of discontent. Emancipation itself employed for a time a number of functionaries in the division of the land and other arrangements connected with the process, who, their work being done, were thrown out of employment; while some of them had been discharged for misconduct, and thus sent into the ranks of revolution. The position of the parish clergy in the Russian church is very low, the high places and wealth of the Church being engrossed by the monks; all parish clergymen are compelled to marry; and their sons form a needy and unhappy class, above manual labour, yet with no liberal careers open to them, and flock into the great cities in quest of bread, which many of them are unable to find. Besides, there are religious malcontents, embittered by the theocratic tendencies which have marred the social liberalism of the present Czar. The Jews also have reason to complain of their condition, and conspire. In the army some seeds of disaffection have been sown by the conscription and by excluding the subalterns and non-commissioned officers from the hope of rising to the higher grades which are monopolized by the nobles. Medical students, bitten by the materialistic philosophy and kept poor by their preference for the study of science to the practice of medicine, have evidently played an important part; and Nihilism has female votaries and coadjutors in the unsexed female students, who go about

with their hair cut short, smoking in the streets. Persons acquainted with Russia say that a number of recruits has been added by the investigations and dismissals for corruption which followed the Turkish war. Mere love of conspiracy, probably, goes for a good deal, especially as Russians are lazy, and conspiracy is easier than work. The extravagance of the Nihilist creed and of the objects of the sect are characteristic of a race only just emerging from barbarism and intellectual torpor, impulsive, shallow, unbalanced in mind, and easily caught by novelty. Alexander Herzen was the originator of the school; but he was left behind in insanity by Michel Bakounine. As developed by Bakounine, Nihilism aims at the total abolition of religion and worship by the propagation of atheism (it does not stick at Agnosticism), scientific and humanitarian; at the substitution of collective for individual ownership of property; at the removal of all distinctions between the sexes; the suppression of the family as it now exists, and of every form of marriage; at the destruction, or "winding up" of the State, with all institutions, ecclesiastical, political, academical, financial, judicial, military and bureaucratic. Such are the ends. The means as the horrified world knows, are conspiracy and assassination Revolutionary societies are apt, unconsciously, to imitate the ways of the Governments against which they war; and in Russia, Nihilism appears to mimic the machinery of the secret police, including the use of bribery. At the centre of the conspiracy is an Executive Committee, which tries the victim in dark conclave, pronounces his doom, and sends forth the emissaries of murder. Secrecy is preserved by terrorism, and by dividing the rank and file into local sections which know nothing of the Central Executive, or of each other. Still, where the secret is so well kept, the number of conspirators can hardly be very large. There is scarcely an instance, in history, of a conspiracy, including a dozen men, which has not been betrayed.

The shroud of darkness which despotism throws round itself by repressing free discussion, serves as the veil of conspiracy

also. There is, no doubt, a large party of moderate, at least of non-satanic, reformers. Probably, there is a large body of reformers willing to co-operate with the Government; but these men cannot avow themselves boldly or act freely, and thus a band of political Thugs has the scene to itself, and threatens to give a fatal direction to the course of political events. Another example of the wisdom of suppressing opinion!

—Nothing is spared by the spirit of change, not even Death. A curious tract called "God's Acre Made Beautiful," has for its direct object the reform of Cemeteries, which it proposes to make "permanent, unpolluted, inviolate" for the future; but it assumes as its basis, and strenuously advocates the adoption of, cremation. That cremation will in the end be adopted is most likely. But custom is strong, and a religious feeling, vague, though deeply seated, conspires with custom in opposition to the change. Rational objection on religious grounds there is really none. As the Bishop of Manchester says, "No intelligent faith can suppose that any Christian doctrine is affected by the manner in which, or the time in which, this mortal body of ours is committed unto dust and sees corruption." No one imagines that a Christian whose body has been burned accidentally, as the bodies of many Christians are, is excluded from the resurrection. Dispose of the corpse as you will, its particles will have been completely dispersed before the end of the world. The very fact that the heathen burned would almost have been enough to repel the early Christians; nor would it have been so easy for them while their religion was still proscribed, to use the Christian ritual in cremations as it was in burials. That public health is in favour of cremation can hardly be denied; the evidence against graveyards, as the tract before us proves, is abundant as well as revolting. In fact, the overcrowding leads often to wholesale desecration, and sometimes to burning. It has been argued with some force that the immediate destruction of the corpse might lend impunity to

poisoning: but it is answered that the danger would be counteracted by a slight increase of medical vigilance, and that in the few cases in which there is the slightest doubt as to the cause of death, the body might be preserved for scientific examination. Against the danger of poisoning may be set that of premature burial, the thought of which makes one's blood creep, and which well attested cases have proved to be only too real; though the medical attendants ought to be hanged when any one is found to have been buried alive. Sentiment, if at all under the guidance of reason, would seem to be in favour of that process by which the cast-off clay with which, on any hypothesis as to the nature of death, we have no longer any concern, would mingle as rapidly as possible with the general frame of nature, and pass into the life of trees and flowers. There was a sort of irrational consistency in the Egyptian practice of embalming; it preserved as long as possible, and in a form as little disgusting as possible, the tenement with which a grovelling fancy could not help identifying the tenant. The worst fashion of all is coffin burial, which protracts the loathsome process of decay. To this repulsive image is added the practical liability to the commission of posthumous murder by breeding pestilence among the living. It is difficult to understand the sentiment, religious, or of any other kind, which would make a man unwilling to relinquish the prospect of being converted into a poisonous gas.

We go with the writer more thoroughly in his views as to the mode of disposing of the dead, than in his plans for the beautification of cemeteries. Death, in any case, is awful and sorrowful; awful as a change, sorrowful as a parting; nor can we see any propriety in the attempt to turn its abode into a pleasure ground. The much praised cemeteries of the United States with their rose walks and pieces of ornamental water have always seemed to us offensive attempts to disguise the sadness of mortality. The old English churchyard with its solemn yew tree is a far better treatment of the theme. Nor does it seem likely that classical temples and columbaria will ever suit

a taste formed under the influence of Christianity, even if Christian doctrine should lose its hold. Supposing it necessary, under the system of cremation, to preserve the dust at all, the Campo Santo probably presents the most congenial and available mode of doing so. It is right in point of sentiment, and gives the fullest play to religious art, or any other art in keeping with the objects of the place. Niches in its cloisters would receive the urns, with the inscription under each. As to individual monuments, the mass of them are wretched attempts to perpetuate memories which cannot be perpetuated. Nothing is more ludicrous, or more pitiable than the museum of posthumous vanities, vying with each other in the shapes of pillar, obelisk, sarcophagus, and pyramid, which one of our cemeteries presents. A rich nobody, who has been dead for a century, and for whom, even in his lifetime, nobody cared, still thrusts himself on your notice with his cumbrous and costly tomb. In death, at all events, there should be equality. To eminent men, and sometimes to eminent malefactors, special monuments will be raised by the community; at all events eminence will have its place in history. But the only monument for which most of us can hope, or ought to care, is the brief survival of our memory cherished in a few hearts till they, too, are turned to dust. Our tombstones, cumbering the ground, mock our mortality. They seem vainly and weakly to solicit from the passer-by a tribute of interest and emotion not to be called forth by an unmeaning name. The simple turf which covers the pauper is really a more dignified tomb.

A serious movement seems to have been set on foot in England for the reformation of funerals. It would be curious to analyse the ritual of the undertaker and to see whence its different portions took their origin and what they represent. The inquiry would probably lead us back to a mixture of original elements, feudal, pagan, and barbaric, moulded into their final form of pensive solemnity and grace by the plastic genius of the undertaker. Can anything be more pitiably grotesque than the sight of one of these funeral processions strug-

gling with the tide of commerce in a London street? Nor is the cost a trifle, at least to the poor, who always feel it a point of honour to give their dead "a decent funeral." In "God's Acre Made Beautiful," an instance is cited of a poor woman, the corpse of whose husband was denied burial by the harpy to whom she had been persuaded to consign it because she could not pay the whole of the extortionate sum which he exacted. The same social process which has extended to everybody the title of Esquire seems to have extended to everybody the obligation of squandering money on a pomp which, in former days, may have been the special appanage of rank. Custom is in this case very tenacious, because mourners cannot give their minds to reforms, and in the moment of affliction economy seems sacrilege. A rebellion, however, has begun, and some day it will extend to long periods of mourning, which, it may be remarked, are enforced with rather unusual strictness in Canada, where Mrs. Grundy is pretty strong. What man of sense would want people to go about in black and abstain from society as a tribute to his memory? Who wants, after his death, to be a pall and a kill-joy to the living? A British Ambassador used to tell a story of his having come to lunch with a family who had come up to the capital for a Court Ball, which was to take place that evening. One of the children asked for a cake and was refused. It threatened "to tell." No attention being paid to its threat, it shouted, "Grandmamma is dead!" The news of the old lady's decease had arrived that morning; but it had been determined, in family council, to suppress it till after the ball, and secrecy had been enjoined accordingly. Of course, after the ball the family went into the deepest mourning, and rigorously secluded themselves from less attractive festivities. This nearly measures the worth of the homage which we exact by making ourselves posthumous nuisances to our kin. The art of the milliner is tasked to render mourning becoming to a fine lady, as the art of the cook in Roman Catholic countries is tasked to render a Lenten dinner palatable to the epicure; and the severity of the self-denial

equals that of the sorrow. The early Christians, at one time, discarded mourning for the dead altogether, and treated the departure of their kinsmen to a better world as an occasion of joy. This was too much for nature; but nature should, at all events, be the limit of mourning. After all, in regard to these matters, as well as to matters of a much more serious kind much depends on the answer to the question, "What is death?" and to that question the human mind is now, for the first time in the history of thought, deliberately, and in the full light of science and philosophy, addressed.

—The controversy between Theism and Agnosticism continues in the press with a vigour which belies the assumption that Canadians take no interest in great problems: nor is it wonderful, for, compared with this question, all others are trivial and superficial. An Agnostic, writing to the *Mail*, undertakes to set forth the Theistic and Materialistic hypotheses, and to explain the ground which Agnosticism takes between them. "The Theist asserts the Eternity of a personal God, and that at His fiat the universe came into existence; the Materialist asserts the Eternity of Matter, and that the universe has gradually grown to what it is by a series of slow processes, acting through countless ages: the Agnostic asserts that both views are equally probable and equally improbable; that a universe uncreated and eternal is just as conceivable as a personal God uncreated and eternal, and that both are equally inconceivable; and further, the Agnostic neither affirms nor denies anything touching these things beyond the scope of the senses, and consequently beyond human knowledge." An uncreated and eternal universe, we venture to submit, is inconceivable, because matter can neither call itself into existence nor set itself in motion, and to figure it to ourselves as doing either is as impospossible as it is to figure to ourselves two straight lines enclosing a space. If matter could call itself into existence, or set itself in motion, the foundation of physical science would be

gone. But no mental impossibility or absurdity attaches to the idea of a self-existent Being, from whom the universe emanates, and of whose life all the creations are, so to speak, the pulses. We cannot comprehend such a Being, or distinctly picture Him to ourselves, it is true; but there is nothing in the conception self-contradictory, or repugnant to the laws of the understanding. On the contrary, the mind seems to acquiesce in this hypothesis as an intelligible, consistent, and adequate account of everything, and especially of our intellectual and moral nature. If, therefore, the attitude of the Agnostic towards the Materialistic and the Theistic hypotheses respectively is determined by the belief that the two are "equally inconceivable," he is, it seems to us, in an untenable position. So he unquestionably is, if his attitude is determined by the belief that "everything which is beyond the scope of the senses must be beyond human knowledge." How does he know the operations of his own mind? Whence does he get the data of mental science and ethics? Not from sense, but from consciousness. Nothing can be more baseless than the assumption that the information supplied by our five bodily senses is exhaustive, and that their authority is final. We act upon the opposite belief every moment of our lives. But this assumption, and the notions connected with it, pervades the conceptions and speculations of the Materialistic school. The supposition, with which we have just been dealing, of the necessity of a series of creators is a pseudo-scientific fancy, bred by the intrusion of the law of physical causation into a sphere to which it does not extend. That the law of physical causation is not universal we have an assurance, if we can have an assurance of anything and our knowledge altogether is not a dream, in our own consciousness, which tells us that our actions and characters are partly determined by ourselves. The Giver of the law of physical causation—and every law implies a lawgiver—must at all events be above his law.

If we were called upon to furnish a practical definition of Agnosticism, we should say that it was doubt—natural, honest.

and often, though not always, reverent doubt—caused by the difficulties and perplexities of a problem which we have at present, however, no reason to pronounce incapable of solution. The Agnostic is perfectly right in refusing to receive as certain anything which has not been proved: he is wrong, we venture to think, in erecting his doubt into a permanent philosophy of despair. Man, being what he is, will never lay aside the desire of learning the truth about his own origin and destiny; he will never be content merely to enjoy his present life (supposing his present life to be enjoyable) without thinking of anything beyond. As to that kind of Agnosticism which refuses to admit knowledge through any medium except the five bodily senses, and on that ground would condemn as hopeless all theological speculation, it appears to us, for the reason just given, to rest on an assumption which is itself perfectly gratuitous.

— The New Reformation is evidently making way in the Churches. Presbyterianism, though from its democratic constitution it is favorable to civil and, in a certain measure, to religious liberty, is also favorable to the conservation of dogma, because it gives to the traditional faith and the enthusiasm of the masses preponderance over the learning of the few. Accordingly, it long remained solid and resisted the new opinions: but now the loosening process has begun. In Scotland Orthodoxy is fighting with doubtful success against Professional heresy. In the Pan-Presbyterian Council at Philadelphia, unwonted and startling voices were heard. We do not refer to the proposals of a liturgy and instrumental music: the stern severity of the worship which suited the Covenanting Church in the wilderness was sure in happier times to yield to softer influences; and extempore prayer, no longer uplifted by extraordinary enthusiasm, was equally sure to become somewhat tedious and somewhat hollow. Far more momentous were the demands for increased liberty of opinion and the assertion of the right of progress for religious as well as scien-

tific thought. An eminent delegate plainly avowed his opinion that the framers of the Westminster Confession could no longer be considered as infallible; that honest doubt about one of its articles was not sufficiently met by the mere application of Church discipline, and that able, learned and conscientious men could not be kept within the pale of the Church upon such terms. The impiety of these representations will not seem inordinate when we remember that the Westminster Confession was not only the work of uninspired men, but of men holding their session amidst the thunders of civil war, and that it was practically rejected at once by the larger and more highly educated of the two nations for which it was composed. Liberal sentiments were also uttered with regard to the attitude of theology towards scientific discovery. It was remarked that the American members of the Council though citizens of a democracy, were more Conservative than the British and some of the Canadians: perhaps, as is said, they were older; we may be pretty sure they were less learned. American Liberalism showed itself in a flash of incipient opposition to the doctrines of Reprobation and Eternal Punishment, which are repugnant to democratic humanity: in fact Universalism is the one great theological movement of which America is the parent, the other Churches being merely reproductions of those of the Old World.

Methodism at Chicago as well as Presbyterianism at Philadelphia is troubled by heretical questionings about Eternal Punishment, and also about the penal theory of the Atonement which in like manner grates on the Republican sentiments of humanity and justice. Methodism, however, is likely to escape the spread of speculative doubt longer than the other Churches, both because the class to which Methodists, as a rule, belong is not the most critical, and because in this Church doctrine, on which speculative doubt fixes, occupies a secondary place compared with religious emotion. Happily for itself the Methodist communion was formed not in dogmatic opposition to the creed of any other Church, but simply in opposition to the vice,

frivolity and scepticism of English society in the eighteenth century. If we may trust our own experience, the discourses of Methodist preachers at the present day are distinguished by a general freedom from polemics and a constant appeal to the motive powers of positive religion.

More significant, perhaps, than even the Liberalism displayed at the Pan-Presbyterian Council is "Scotch Sermons," a collection of discourses by divines of the Scottish Church, published by Messrs. Macmillan. This book reminds us of the "Essays and Reviews," which twenty years ago set the Church of England on fire, though now, so rapid has been the march of heresy, they would hardly be noticed as particularly rationalistic. In "Scotch Sermons" the necessity of believing in the miracles of the New Testament is denied, and the exaction of such belief as a condition of communion is denounced as "intolerance which ought to be resisted." It is pretty clear that the cause which the preacher pleads is his own, and that though he does not formally adopt, he is disposed to embrace, the explanation of the miracles as "a celestial radiance which enveloped Christianity at its birth," and an example of the instinctive tendency to surround with extraordinary phenomena any new moral and spiritual enterprise. He deprecates the assumption that Christianity was purest when it was nearest to its birth, affirming that on the contrary it has, in its progress, worked off impurities and that the process is not yet complete; while among the human, transitory, and unessential elements, which, as the generations pass, fall into the background, he numbers "miracles apostolic ordinance, and the clinging remnants of that Judaism which puts assent to dogma in place of faith."

On the other hand, we find in portions of this volume, as in all half-gagged utterances, a reserve, an indirectness, a preference of suggestion to plain statement, which are more disquieting and more productive of scepticism, in the worst sense, than the most complete unbosoming would be. The fear of ecclesiastical censure is present all the time, and prevents any one of the writers from grappling boldly with the questions and giv-

ing us frankly the positive as well as the negative side of his belief. The author of the sermon on "*Conservation and Change*" promulgates a theory of politic reticence which reminds us of the "economy" formerly adopted by Tractarian leaders in order to enable Roman Catholics to remain in a Protestant Church. He represents ecclesiastical establishments as "organisms," the life of which it would be murder to bring to an untimely close. Pseudo-physical theories of history seem to be generating a spirit of fatalism and jesuitism combined. In private affairs, what man of science would think of putting up with falsehood when he could get truth, or with a bad thing when he could get a good thing, for fear of doing injury to the vital tissues of some social organism? The Westminster Confession and the formularies of the Church of England did not "grow" of themselves: they were made, if ever anything was made,—the Westminster Confession by the Westminster divines, the formularies of the Church of England by Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. In a certain sense one's hat is a growth; it is the outcome of a multitude of elements and forces; it has its natural antecedents, traceable back to the original nebula; nevertheless, you pay your hatter and change him if his hats do not suit. The only "life" worthy of respect which an institution can have is beneficence; the only life worthy of respect which a creed can have is truth. Tenderness in dealing with anything established is right, but no Darwinian fancy can absolve us from active allegiance to truth or duty. A clergy of crypto-sceptics would be a fearful source of moral pestilence.

So apparently thinks the Rev. Stopford Brooke, an eminent preacher and writer who secedes from the Established Church of England on the ground that, though a Christian, he is an Anglican no more. Yet he has as much right, perhaps, to stay in the Establishment as scores of "Broad Church" clergymen whom he leaves behind—certainly as much right as Ritualists adoring the Host in a Church which denounces such adoration as "idolatry." Let us pay him the honours due to a faithful liegeman of the truth.

Principal Cavan says we must have dogma. We hope the distinguished theologian means doctrine. Doctrine of course we must have; no religion, not even that of Swedenborg or Madame Guyon, can consist of mere emotion or aspiration, without any intellectual belief. But dogma, which is unreason imposed by ecclesiastical authority, may, it is to be hoped, be laid aside, because it forms a fatal obstacle to that union of the Christian Churches, towards which the hearts and minds of the best and wisest Christians are evidently turning. The grand example of dogma is the Athanasian creed; and the grand example of the dogmatic spirit is the curse laid by that creed on all who do not believe propositions to which no human mind can attach any meaning whatever. Christianity has been hitherto bearing a load of sacerdotalism, paganism and Byzantine theosophy, the last of which is the great source of dogma, and is no more of the essence of the religion then the other two.

— Moral as well as theological heresy was broached at Philadelphia. A delegate ventured on the astounding assertion that a temperate man is not intemperate, and he now says that taking a glass of wine with your meal is not so bad as going to a brothel. If the second proposition is false the Pharisees must have had a better case than is commonly supposed. Temperance and abstinence are two different things. Dr. Johnson said that he found abstinence easier than temperance; but he knew that his own character was a moral paradox. To ordinary men, temperance is easier than abstinence: they need a certain amount of enjoyment; and if you cut them off altogether from one sort they will take more of other sorts. Monastic asceticism, as experience has shown, distorts human nature, but does not raise it. The exaggeration of one particular point of morality has a somewhat analogous effect: people who think themselves much better than their neighbours because they only drink tea, are sometimes apt to sugar their tea with scandal.

THE BYSTANDER.

DECEMBER, 1880.

IN saying that the Pacific Railway Agreement ought to carry with it the assent, not only of a parliamentary majority, but of the nation, we did not mean to advocate a dissolution of Parliament. What we meant was, that the terms should, as soon as possible, be communicated to the country, and that time should be given before the meeting of Parliament for full consideration and discussion, so that the members might go to Ottawa instructed and fortified by the opinions of their constituents. There could be nothing in this derogatory in the slightest degree to the authority of the Legislature, while it would have been a simple act of justice to the country. But we must wait to hear the explanation of the Government.

In addition to the more obvious reasons for obtaining, if possible, the free and indisputable assent of the nation to a compact, the operation of which will extend over a period long enough to give time for more than one change of Government, and more than one change of the national mood, another not so obvious, at least not as yet noticed, may be mentioned. The Provinces of the North-West, as they fill up, will begin to have interests and a will of their own. They will feel their prospective as well as their actual importance, and be no longer content to be dealt with as a mere possession by provinces destined, if the Confederation holds together, to be in proportion

to them no more than New Brunswick is to Old Canada. They will think that they have a peculiar title to their own lands, and will jealously scrutinize every use of them, or of the money raised by selling them, for objects in which they have no special concern, particularly if, at the same time, they find themselves in want of the railways and other means of communication, without which expanses of prairie, be they never so fertile, are worth no more than so many millions of acres in Sahara. In Manitoba symptoms of political life and of a consciousness of Provincial interests are just beginning to appear. If the pressure of the tariff is felt by her population, as felt it is likely to be, and indeed with regard to coal already is, her assumption of an independent attitude will be hastened, and a strain will so much the earlier be put on any compact made at her expense, which she may not deem to her advantage.

Our own conviction on the general question need hardly be repeated. We should deprecate the committal of the country to the construction of those portions of the line which, as matters now stand, must be deemed unprofitable, that is to say, the Mountain section and that to the north of Lake Superior. We should deal with the whole subject on a commercial footing, being persuaded, that what is best for the country commercially is also best for her politically, and that her greatest danger is the accumulation of debt, which may ultimately deprive her of the control of her own destinies. We should have said—"The North-west Territory is a rich heritage which has fallen to Canada. Let us first thoroughly open up the territory itself and realize the wealth which it contains, by providing it through its whole extent with railways and by inviting population. If, when this is done, a surplus fund of land still remains, let it be applied to the completing of an inter-oceanic line within the Canadian border, if that seems desirable; if not, to the reduction of the national debt." There are those who believe that the antagonism between Canada and her neighbours, on which the project of a political and military line is founded, will continue and even increase: there are others to whom it seems

to be melting away like April snow. Again, the northern coast of Lake Superior, may prove, as some assert, to be a country teeming with mines, and sure to attract a great mining population. In that case, a railway carried through it, instead of being commercially unproductive, will pay well, and the whole case, including the character of the present bargain, will be greatly changed.

We, by no means, feel sure that could the question have been fairly put to the people, we should not have had them on our side. Matters, however, have taken a different course. The political and military objects connected with the Anti-Continental policy have prevailed. They have prevailed with both the parties, for the late Government adopted the entire scheme, and betraying its misgivings only by being more hesitating in execution than the present. Canada stands committed to the construction of the political and military line. But upon commencing the enterprise as a Government work, the difficulties and evils which always beset great works undertaken by Governments have appeared. It has become evident that a vast commercial enterprise in the North-west cannot be properly managed by a political department at Ottawa: the contracts have given birth, as the evidence taken by the Royal Commission shows, to jobbery and corruption on the scale usual in such cases; party hostility interferes with the operations; a prospect of indefinite expenditure is opened, and a burden of uncertain magnitude presses on the commercial spirit of the country. The Government, therefore, has resolved to transfer the undertaking to a Company, and its resolution is beyond doubt approved by the nation, which received the announcement of the successful result of the negotiations with universal expressions of relief. The agreement, at the time of our writing, is not before us in detail, but its main conditions seem to be known. The Government gives the Company twenty-five millions of dollars and twenty-five millions of acres of land. On what principle the land is to be selected does not yet appear, but it is stated to be valued at two dollars an acre. The Government finishes the road from

Thunder Bay to Selkirk, and from the Pacific to Kamloops, and hands those sections over to the company when the whole road is finished. The Company gives as security for the construction, one million of dollars, and five million acres of its land. The Government is to continue to hold this security, paying interest on it to the Company, for a period after the completion of the line sufficient to prove satisfactorily that the perpetual working of the road has been secured. The road, it is to be inferred from this arrangement, does not revert to the Government, but becomes the property of the Company. We must leave it to railway experts and others familiar with the subject to pass judgment on these terms. That the country should have to pay fifty-five millions in hard cash, to say nothing of the land grant, for the building of a railway, which, after all, is not to be its own, appears to us a severe comment on the Anti-Continental policy. For our own part we should of course propose to amend the agreement by separating the Prairie, Mountain, and Lake Superior sections, from each other, apportioning the subsidy, and leaving it open to the nation to decide, when the Prairie section has been finished, whether the other sections shall be constructed or not. But supposing this to be out of the question, all we have to say is, that the ablest negotiators have been employed on the part of the country, that their own reputation and position as public men were staked upon the issue, and there can be no doubt that they have done their best. That the bargain is a good one for the Company may be taken for granted: no body of capitalists would have embarked on so vast and perilous an undertaking without a prospect of large gains. But what is a good bargain for the Company may not be a bad one for us, since a commercial Company may reasonably expect, by superior management, to make profit which a government could not make, and to avoid losses which a government could not avoid. Immigration will now be effectively pushed, and the value of the land which remains in the hands of the Government will be increased. At all events, uncertainty and indefinite liability are

at an end. Perhaps the clearest and greatest gain of all is, that we are rescued, politically as well as commercially, from a yawning abyss of jobbery and corruption.

It has been naturally remarked that the Syndicate does not contain those names of colossal European firms which were expected to appear. The members of the Government have partly to thank their own too sanguine language for any disappointment which the absence of the Barings, the Erlangers, the Paris Rothschilds may have produced in the public mind. On the other hand, there can be no doubt as to the perfect respectability and trustworthiness of the men with whom the agreement has actually been made: what they have undertaken they will perform to the best of their power, and the commercial honour of the country, so far as it is entrusted to them, will be safe in their hands. Nor is there reason to fear now or hereafter intrigues between them and the Government against the interest of the nation. They are not the men, nor do they resemble the men, who ten years ago commenced their operations as applicants for the construction of the line by deliberately setting to work to corrupt the Government through Sir George Cartier. Vague apprehensions are afloat that the interests of the public enterprise will in some way be made subservient to those of the St. Paul and Minneapolis Road owned by the leading members of the Syndicate: but the line of the Pacific Railway laid out by Government cannot be altered; and if its construction benefits the St. Paul and Minneapolis Road, no harm is done to us. The fact is that without the sort of basis afforded for a Syndicate by the St. Paul and Minneapolis Road, we should hardly have found a trustworthy body of capitalists to undertake this work.

It may safely be assumed that the Pacific Railway Agreement will occupy Parliament from the ninth of December to Christmas, so that to touch on other questions at present would be premature. Not that we look forward to a tough or protracted struggle on the subject of the Agreement. The Opposition may make a good point on the refusal of the Gov-

ernment to make known the conditions to the country, but otherwise its position is weak. It has thoroughly committed itself to a policy with regard to the general question identical with that of the Government; and, if it attempted to prevent the transfer of the construction to a company, it would have the whole country against it. In power, it accepted the undertaking and carried it on as a government work; while its organ persistently goaded on the country to the enterprise, and impugned the motives of those who were trying to bring the other side of the question before the people. Nor is any one, except the regular leaders of the Opposition, likely to make a stand; not one has done so at any stage of the affair. In whatever respects the Canadian Parliament may resemble that of England, it lacks the sturdy eccentricity of the Cross Benches. In the English Parliament, if public interests so great had been at stake, there would unquestionably have been found a man who, in defiance alike of majorities and of conventional opinion, would have fought his battle unflinchingly, and forced his view of the question on the consideration of the country.

—Amid the jubilant voices of 'the Hum,' it is to be hoped that a note of gentle warning will not grate too harshly on the public ear. The causes of commercial improvement and of the present rise, not to say inflation, of all stocks and securities, are two good harvests and the revival of the lumber trade, in connection with the general termination of the crisis in the United States and over the world at large. The cause is not increased taxation, however skilfully the new taxes may have been adjusted; and the tour which the Finance Minister has been making to see the happy fruits of his new Customs' duties in creating wealth, though gracious and politic, is not without its comic side. It would be a sad mistake, therefore, to suppose that a further increase of prosperity could be produced at will by a fresh increase of the taxes, or that it is desirable to maintain taxation at its present rate one moment beyond the actual

existence of the fiscal need. As the harvests and the lumber are the causes of the commercial improvement, so they are its measure, which no legislation can enlarge. It is necessary to lay this to heart, lest, in the fond belief that we have discovered a legislative talisman capable of conjuring wealth to any extent out of aggravated imposts, we should be led to plunge into a course of boundless importation, multiplication of manufactures, and bonus granting, which must soon end in disaster. Many seem to think that Canada is prevented from doing an enormous trade only by want of commercial legislation, or of puffing, or of some nostrum which the Canadian Government or that of the Mother Country, if it had the good-will and energy, could apply. But the reason why Canada is not doing an enormous trade is that she has only four millions of people, one million of whom, at least—the French Canadians—are extremely poor, while the amount of her good land is limited, almost all of it is taken up, and not a little of it is exhausted. She is also deeply in debt, and has yearly to send a large sum in the way of interest to England. Her purchasing power, therefore, is not infinite, nor the market she affords unbounded, either for imported goods or for those manufactured at home. The number of banks, loan societies, and insurance companies which the wealth and commercial transactions of such a community will support is limited, though from the multiplication of such institutions it seems there are speculators who fancy that it is not. General and steady prosperity awaits our people if they will be guided by a sober view of facts: if they allow themselves to be misled by rhetorical fictions, a period of exaggerated hope and boundless speculation will end in another crash.

—The changes in the Ministry do not much affect its character in any respect: certainly they do not widen its basis. There were some who cherished the hope that Sir John Macdonald might use his personal ascendancy to liberate the country in

some measure from the dominion of faction, and make government more national. Had he done this, his career would have closed gloriously. But among the tests of greatness, some one has numbered the power of taking in new ideas after fifty, and the difficulty of the fact is increased when the old ideas block the avenues of the mind in the shape of comrades and expectant partisans. The only move in the direction of a broader basis has been the employment, we fear we ought rather to say the waste, of Sir Alexander Galt. It is something, however, that Sir John Macdonald has always been true to the public interest in the appointment of judges: let us hope that he will persevere in this course, and follow the good example of the British Government, which now sets aside party altogether in most of the judicial appointments, reserving only the very highest as the rewards of its Law Officers. In the country, unless all visible symptoms deceive us, the feeling against Partyism, and in favour of National Government, gains ground. The process is slow, of course, because the existing system is of long standing, deeply rooted in habit, and supported by powerful organizations, the members of which have a personal interest in its continuance. But to say that a reform is difficult, and probably distant, is not to despair. If patriotic citizens are satisfied that National Government is better for the community than government by faction, and if they will keep the object steadily in view, and press towards it whenever an opening is presented, a happy moment may at length arrive, and the "impracticable" and "chimerical" may all at once become a fact.

—The Montreal *Journal of Commerce* will not let THE BYSTANDER alone. Perhaps its manager would himself prefer, like his excellent compeer, the Toronto *Monetary Times*, to exclude politics and, still more, personalities from his columns. But he, no doubt, finds Sir Francis Hincks irrepressible as well as inexhaustible. We mete to Sir Francis Hincks with his own measure, as he chooses, in defiance of the rules of the profession,

to attack by name the author of unsigned articles. The Knight is sorrowful because Conservative journals will not follow the bright example of the *Globe*, which he holds up for their imitation, in pursuing with calumny and insult a literary brother who has the honour to be the object of his hatred. The journals in question have only said that, however much they might dislike a man's opinions, they did not want anybody to be hounded down. Sir Francis does want somebody to be hounded down, and therefore mere forbearance seems to him "systematic toadying." Was it "systematic toadying" when, on a recent legal occasion, affecting his personal character and feelings, he received equitable treatment at the hands of writers whose political opinions are opposed to his own? Those whom he chides for their lukewarmness may feel that they are above all things members of an honourable profession, the privileges and courtesies of which they are bound to regard. They may also, on general grounds, have been unwilling to join a ring of assailants whose motives were manifestly personal, and who, with powerful organs at their command, were setting on a defenceless man. We believe Sir Francis when he intimates that no insult is gross enough if aimed at the right object, to seem to him libellous, and that he is unable to conceive how the use of such weapons can be deemed an interference with the freedom of discussion. He has succeeded, at all events, in proving that modern knighthood is an institution, adapted to the requirements of a practical age, and has no connection with the fantastic chivalry of the past.

Sir Francis Hincks avers that we have "imputed to the party of which the *Mail* is an organ that, openly professing loyalty its members are consummate hypocrites and secret advocates of annexation." We beg leave most respectfully to intimate that he must himself be aware of the character of his statement. "A moral reunion of all who own Great Britain as their parent and speak the tongue of Shakespeare" is turned by his plastic fancy into a political annexation of Canada to the United States. Who talked or thought of hypocrisy? Mr.

Thomas Hughes, by founding an English Colony in Tennessee, shows that he feels the influence of the moral reunion; yet, with a sincerity which no one doubts, he deprecates Annexation. Supposing we had even said that the tide of feeling was turning, does change imply hypocrisy? Was not Sir Francis Hincks once a Radical, and is he not now a Conservative lecturing "revolutionists" with the horrified solemnity of a Tory Duke! Between these two extreme points of a distinguished career there must have been a time when his sentiments were on the turn, but when it would, nevertheless, have been as absurd to accuse him of hypocrisy as it would have been to accuse him of corruption.

Our critic has a keen and practised eye for motive. In one page we claim a fair hearing for the result of Sir John Macdonald's proposed negotiations respecting the Pacific Railway, in the next we defend Mr. Blake against an attack made on him by Sir John Macdonald. This shows, it seems, that we "have two strings to our bow," and that if our concealed, and presumably nefarious, object cannot be obtained by paying "homage" to Sir John Macdonald we hope to obtain it by paying homage to Mr. Blake. It matters not that we have often avowed our dissent from the particular line taken by one of those statesmen, and from the general policy of the other. These, no doubt, are blinds to cover a crafty approach. We shall be glad to hear what it is that is to be compassed by flattering at the same time the leaders of two opposite parties; but pending this disclosure, we take the liberty of assuring our critic that we neither owe nor pay homage to any man in the Dominion.

Scarcely had this journal appeared, when Sir Francis Hincks tried to stop its sale by proclaiming through the reporter of an American paper that it was brought out for the purpose of advocating Annexation. We condole with him on the result of his generous effort. The BYSTANDER was brought out for the purpose of reviewing Current Events, Canadian and general; the Canadian Events in the interest of the whole Canadian people, and in that interest alone. Of such mental labour as has been

bestowed upon it not a twentieth part, we will venture to say, has been devoted to the subject of the relations between Canada and the United States. Our tendency from the first has been to increase the literary portion of the journal at the expense of the political department; and we should have gone further in this direction had we not been stopped by the remonstrances of friends. We have taken subjects just as they have presented themselves. Two great questions, the Tariff and the Railway Policy, have been before the people since the BYSTANDER appeared. Neither of them could be discussed without reference to our relations with the people of the United States, and to the terms, whether of antagonism or partnership, on which we may be destined to live with them on this continent. The prevailing policy respecting Government railways is based on the assumption of perpetual antagonism, and is an attempt to give effect to that principle at prodigious cost to the nation. If Sir Francis Hincks, instead of hooting at us, would have read us, he would know that we have never mentioned political annexation except to show that it is not a necessary consequence of commercial union. Frail indeed would be a political allegiance which depended on the continuance of a customs line. Commercial union, we beg leave, in answer to Sir Francis Hincks' reiterated inquiries, once more to inform him is complete reciprocity; and if complete reciprocity is annexation, he and the other advocates of partial reciprocity must be at least half annexationists. But suppose we had broached the political question, are Canadians alone to be gagged? You can hardly take up a newspaper without seeing a notice of some article in the English press, dealing freely with our concerns. One paper by Mr. Anderson and another by Mr. Clarke have just appeared, discussing the destinies of this country without reserve. A Conservative member of the British Parliament has given notice of a motion for next session which, if carried, would entirely "revolutionize" our political relations. Is Canada to be silent while that motion is debated, or are her thoughts to be confined to a circle authoritatively traced for her by Sir Francis Hincks?

If Sir Francis is bent on keeping up antagonism to the rest of the continent, and demands a policy founded on that principle, why does he not use his pen against the agencies which he must see plainly enough are carrying us the other way? Canadians are crossing the line by tens of thousands, and of those who remain there is not one in a hundred who would not be ready to go if he were assured that by doing so he would improve his own condition and that of his family. This fact is decisive, not in favour of annexation, but against the anti-Continental policy and the expenditure of the people's earnings at the rate of fifty-five millions in a lump on anti-Continental objects. Sir Francis would do well also to turn his attention to the progress of sentiment in the Mother Country, which for his policy is most untoward. He cannot have failed to note the marked and almost unparalleled attentions which are being paid to the American ambassador, and he knows enough of English society to understand that the acceptance, by an English County, of an American as the Master of the Hunt, which was mentioned in our journals the other day, is in its way a significant fact. He will hardly enjoin us, in the name of loyalty, to persevere in an antipathy which the Mother Country has renounced. He has the sea to mop out; and will find plenty employment for his mop without thrusting it perpetually into our face. We never said or thought of saying a word against him if he would only have left us at peace, or criticized us temperately, and without breaking the rules of the profession.

That the present state of things is not final but provisional, is avowed by everybody who speaks or writes upon the subject, by the Conservatives and advocates of Imperial Federation as distinctly as their opponents, while, on the other hand, no one—certainly no one connected with this journal—has the slightest interest in precipitating the course of events. In one way or other the Canadian statesmen of the next generation will be called upon to act upon an ampler scene, and to deal with greater questions than those of the present. If any one of them shall hereafter have reason to think, as he looks

back, that the frank discussion of all questions in these pages has helped in the slightest degree to prepare him for his part the special object of the BYSTANDER will have been fulfilled.

—All will applaud the gallantry of the young members of Toronto University who assemble to vindicate what they deem the rights of women. It can hardly be said that a person who has received from the State a high education is positively injured because that education is not carried higher; still if a young lady is distinctly prepared at the High Schools for a male University career and taught to look forward to it as the completion of her course, her exclusion is undoubtedly a hardship. But the question whether young ladies ought to be prepared at the High Schools for a male University career, is one of several cognate problems relating to our system of education which demand, and it is to be hoped will soon receive, the attention of the community. Not the slightest disloyalty to the cause of public education is implied in saying that the high pressure system begins to breed misgivings, both in those who look at the matter from the medical, and in those who look at it from the economical, point of view. In reminding the advocates of Co-education that the moral and social as well as the intellectual bearings of the system required consideration, we meant only to distinguish the effect on the character in its twofold aspect from the effect on mind: we did not allude particularly to the danger of runaway matches or anything else that is indelicate; though it seems to us preposterous to treat co-education at the University as a mere sequel to co-education at the High Schools, ignoring altogether the important fact of puberty. Is it intended that the system shall be made universal and that all the young ladies of the wealthier class, without distinction of disposition or circumstances, shall be thrown with all the young gentlemen of the same class in common Universities; or is it intended to limit the experiment to a select few? In the latter case, we shall not raise the

education of women generally, but on the contrary rather lower it, by taking away the intellectual leaven from the lump: in the former case, surely, we shall have to encounter moral and social difficulties on a large scale. Zurich produced a female student life which startled Europe and caused German Universities to recoil from the plan. Caution is inspired, we must repeat, by the evident connection of the co-education scheme with a general attempt to change the relations of the sexes, the success of which would be the most momentous of all social revolutions. We are Liberals, cordially desirous of giving free play to all reasonable aspirations, and willing to run considerable risks in the way of experiment as often as it appears likely that the lot of any part of the human race can be changed for the better; but, when all has been said that can reasonably be said about the defects of the present system of female education, we cannot help regarding a gentle and accomplished Englishwoman who as a wife and mother is performing well the highest of human duties, as an article too precious to be flung into the smelting pot without a considerable probability of improvement.

To provide employment for unmarried women thrown on their own resources is an excellent object, and one which commands our warmest sympathies. But would it be promoted by co-education? Few women, surely, can look forward to making their bread by the practice of the learned professions. That course would require a renunciation of marriage, certainly of maternity, to which, unless female character and aspirations undergo a total change, women would rarely be willing to resign themselves on the threshold of life. A woman may study theology, law, or medicine, but she cannot possibly mind a baby and attend to a congregation, client, or patients at the same time. There are a few female ministers of religion, but the fashion appears not to gain ground. There are women practising medicine with success, yet of these again the number is small, though larger than that of the female preachers; and the anticipation that female patients would prefer physicians of their

own sex does not seem to have been generally fulfilled. As to law, its paramount object is justice, not provision for the maintenance of lawyers: and how is that object to be attained if we are to have female advocates appealing to the feelings of male jurymen, and male advocates appealing to the feelings of female jurymen? It is vain to suppose that by merely shutting our eyes and minds, we can really exclude the influence of sex. Politics is a trade into which, even if it is destined to last, no woman who retained a vestige of her sex would wish to go. It must be remembered, too, that every female minister, physician, or lawyer—those callings being already over-filled—would take away the bread from a man and from the man's wife. We have urged, in connection with this question, the expediency of encouraging the Art Schools, which may train women for a considerable variety of employments, suited to the special conditions of their life, as well as to their special gifts, and not incompatible with domestic occupations. In this direction probably there is most to be hoped. We are glad to see that the Toronto School of Art is doing well and that our Christmas bookstores display in increasing measure the fruits of female taste and of the fine touch of the female hand. Good schools of Music might be a valuable addition to the Schools of Art.

The Co-education movement is connected not only with a general tendency to revolutionize the relations between the sexes, which touches the foundation of society, but with ideas about the necessity, or the unspeakable advantage in all cases, of education carried to a high pitch, into the correctness of which the world will have some day to look. Some persons are marked out for the life to which a learned and scientific training is essential, without being on that account a bit better or a bit happier than their neighbours; for it is an utterly groundless and perverse fancy which draws distinctions of higher and lower between honest callings, all equally necessary to the common work and the common weal of humanity. The mass are destined to active pursuits or business which, we are persuaded, it is better as a general rule that they should enter

as soon as a sound practical education has been received. Ordinary occupations, commercial or domestic, happily do not now preclude the enjoyment of intellectual pleasures, since books, journals, and other sources of instruction are placed within everybody's reach, and the Professor himself teaches not orally only, as in bygone ages, but in print. Co-education practically goes on, for both sexes, if they do not sit in the same class room, read the same books at home. Mere stimulation of the brain during youth may be no benefit, but the reverse, nor is human happiness likely to be increased by kindling an intellectual ambition, which cannot be satisfied, in the hearts of all mankind.

If it is urged that Co-education prevails in the United States, but we must say that this is no rule for us. One of these communities cannot do the rest a better service than by asserting in social questions its right to separate deliberation, and refusing to be swept by any wave of fashion that may be passing over another portion of the Continent. But the adoption of Co-education in the United States is by no means universal. Principal Eliot, of Harvard, a most liberal-minded man, after personally inspecting the various Co-educational institutions and weighing the results of his inspection, decided against the change. He was denounced with great virulence, but his firmness did not give way. The founder of Cornell University was a noble-hearted and admirable man, but he was totally without experience in University matters, and his ignorance, combined with his enthusiasm, interfered to no small extent with the good effects of his benefaction. One of his hobbies was the union of manual labour with University studies, which has failed. Another was Co-education, which is weak, though it has been supported with princely munificence by a second Cornell. Certainly the result has not yet fulfilled the visions of the female advocate of Women's Rights, who closed a speech full of peculiar social doctrines by assuring Mr. Cornell that when his University had been opened to women "his anniversary would be celebrated with the same reverence as the Fourth

of July or the coming of Christ." Female Colleges, such as Vassar, Elmira, and Wells, have not, so far as we are aware, declined in favour. But let Cornell carry on its founder's experiment, which it is doing under the most auspicious circumstances, with a beautiful, though as yet poorly filled, boarding-house for the female students, and beneath the eye of the most generous of foster-fathers. Experimentation on the relations between the sexes is more costly and perilous than experimentation on the Edison light.

—There is one feature of the Presidential Election which the more sober-minded even of the vanquished party will recognise as good—the result is decisive: all mutterings about a Protest and a Count have died away. We surmised that, the Ohio and Indiana elections having indicated an inclination of the balance to the Republican side, Commerce, to avoid the fell possibility of a dispute, would be likely to throw her weight into that scale. The danger of a count, with passions at fever heat, was perhaps greater than Americans knew. They have had so many escapes that they are in rather a happy-go-lucky frame of mind. But once they did not escape. People do not go, they are drawn, into civil war. Matters come to a deadlock, amidst frenzied excitement, and then the hand is laid upon the sword.

The American people were doing well: their trade had revived, their finances were flourishing, their debt was being reduced: they shrank from a revolution in government which would have put all this to hazard. They knew that whatever Mr. Bayard or Mr. Tilden might say, and however sound the policy of such Democrats might be, Tammany and other sinister elements were behind, and that rule would be really in the hands of the imperious South. The Republican party had shown too clearly the bad effects of a long tenure of power, though far less under Mr. Hayes than under General Grant: many would have been willing to consent to a change on this account as well as on the general principle that, under the party system,

turn and turn about is the best rule. But the risk was too great to be run. Besides, from the Bosses to Garfield is a great and happy change. This, we conceive, is the real account of the Republican victory. Of Bloody-shirt feeling against the South there was little trace: appeals of that kind fell dead: but not to want to exterminate people is one thing, to want to be governed by them is another. Nor can we believe that the abstract question between National Government and State Right had much influence. Slavery was a disuniting force; so, in a less degree, is White Ascendency, the relic of Slavery: but the States of the Union are now so welded together by railways, canals, and every kind of commercial, as well as every kind of social, connection, that no Administration could possibly infuse much vigour into the separatist doctrine of State Right. This, we apprehend, the people feel, and know that the party in power, be it Democrat or Republican, is for centralization, and the party out of power for local independence.

The Protectionists naturally persuade themselves that it was upon their issue that the battle was fought and won. They say that it was being lost on the common issues when Protection was taken up; and that the change of front turned the day. Political troops must be very well in hand if they can execute such a change of front under fire. The weakness of Free Trade has been revealed: evidently its friends are lukewarm, while its enemies in both camps are ardent, having special interests to defend. We do not believe that more can be said; but this is a sufficient answer to Canadian journalists who fancy that in sympathizing with the Democratic party, they are sympathising with the party of Free Trade. If manufactures grow at the South, the Democratic party will be less energetically Free Trade than it is now. On the other hand the Republicans, if they go on managing the finances well and diminishing the necessity for taxation by reducing the debt, will be Revisors of the Tariff in spite of themselves. Nobody now-a-days would advocate the imposition of taxes on the people, merely for the purpose of keeping out foreign

goods; nor could any party with such a policy hope to hold power.

A bad feature of the election was the sharp line once more drawn between North and South: but for this there was no help. The political action of communities is determined, at bottom by their social structure; and the social structure of the South is still radically different from that of the North: Southern society resembles that of the West Indies after emancipation, which could not have been safely permitted to rule England. Time, intercourse with the North, immigration not only from the North but from England, industry, the growth of manufactures and commerce will soften the dividing line: effaced it can never be so long as the South contains a dominant and a subject race. Happily in this case there is no Irish Channel. It is the fatal tendency of these contests for the Presidency to sharpen and emphasize all sectional divisions, as well as to bring all dangerous questions to a crisis. But the South appears to have borne the defeat well, to show less resentment in fact than the Northern wing of its party. This is the good effect of the policy of President Hayes, which the Bosses denounced because their rolling stock was on the other line. The Southerners have, in truth, lost nothing; they might have lost a good deal had they by four years of domination, in company with Tammany and other powers of evil at the North, disturbed commerce, alarmed the country, reawakened the feelings, if not reopened the issues, of the Civil War, and been hurled down in 1884 by a violent recoil.

General Garfield sets down, as one of the greatest results, the defeat of personal calumny. When the people are asked to place in a man's hand an immense trust, it is natural and right that his character should be closely scrutinized; but this is a different thing from political assassination. The persecution of Mr. Tilden for pretended non-payment of his income-tax was detestable, so were the attempts to destroy the character of General Garfield. The number 329 which was posted and placarded everywhere by his enemies, itself confuted the slander-

ous tale which it told. Was it possible that a politician of mark, however corrupt, should have been such an idiot as to sell his reputation for three hundred and twenty-nine dollars? The character of General Garfield is as pure as that of Mr. Hayes, and as that of any party politician can be.

The President Elect is a man of feeling and taste, but he is also a strong man, and it is not likely that he will be betrayed by any party passion or thirst of party applause into a departure from the path of equity towards the South and general moderation happily traced by his predecessor. It is said that he means to keep the present Secretary of the Treasury, as a pledge of the continuance of Resumption policy. A measure of Civil Service reform, larger than that on which the present Administration has had strength to enter will be expected at his hands by some of the best of his supporters. But to Party, Civil Service reform is an arduous undertaking: both factions stand in need of the bribery fund, without which their followings cannot be held together or the services of their wirepullers enlisted. It is not of increase of efficiency that the Civil Service of the United States stands in need so much as of increase of purity. The native intelligence and versatility of the people to a great extent supply the place of special training: nothing can be more preposterous or apparently more fatal to good administration than a political rotation of Postmasters, yet if we may trust our own experience the postal administration is good and the same may be said with regard to the police, which is also appointed by party. Against the Customs administration there are loud complaints, on the ground, not of inefficiency, but of corruption. The only department which requires a very special training is that of Foreign Affairs, and this, in the case of the United States, is on a small scale. Competitive examination is, we confess, no idol of ours: it is a safeguard against jobbery when honest appointments cannot be secured; but we prefer honest appointment by the head of the department, who is at liberty to look to trustworthiness as well as to ability and knowledge, and ought to be the best judge of what the service

needs. The Spoils system it is that, by breeding a swarm of mercenary politicians, who distract the country by their venal struggles, is the curse of the Republic: and the cure for this evil would be a Constitutional Amendment enacting that no person in the service of the United States, other than a member of the political executive, should be deprived of his place without cause duly assigned. Abolition of the office would, of course, be cause as well as inefficiency, breach of duty, or superannuation. Never, we fear, has the necessity of such a reform been more apparent than it is now. In the late election all the officeholders were taxed as usual, Presidential ordinances to the contrary notwithstanding: a vast sum must have been raised in this way and spent in various forms of bribery. General Garfield may perhaps say with truth that his election is a triumph over calumny: we are strangely misinformed if he can say with truth that it is a triumph over electoral corruption. Again we are constrained to ask how the political character of any nation can withstand forever the virus of evil passion and corruption which these vast faction fights infuse?

Little was heard of the Greenbackers; nor at this moment do we know exactly what vote they polled. In Illinois the number was 25,000, in Missouri 35,000, in Iowa 33,000. We are told that when the official returns come in the total will not fall short of half a million. Of the nominal Greenbackers many were no doubt absorbed by the two great parties, especially, we may be sure, by the Democratic party, as the party hostile to Resumption. Fusion in Maine proved affinity at all events, whatever may have been the exact relations of its elements. It seems clear, however, that Fiat Money has received a total overthrow. Not there—not in sham currency—lies the hope of improving the lot of the working class. Nor does it lie in taking banking or any department of commerce out of commercial hands and putting it into the hands of demagogues, incarnations of mere envy and malignity, to be ruined in the name of the State. A "National" party which would give itself to promoting the material inter-

ests of the people, without regard to the old organizations and their regulation issues, would command the hearty sympathy of those who look at things from our point of view. But its objects would be the repression of faction, the punishment of corruption, the administration of government not in the interest of any party or section, nor of any class, whether artisan or millionaire, but of the whole nation. A movement of this kind would have life in it and a future. We congratulate the Nationals, if the statement is true, on the departure from public life of Dennis Kearney. Far be it from us to misjudge any man who stands forth to plead the cause of labour or the poor, merely because he is rough or even violent. The world too often slumbers over injustice and needs a rude awakening. But this man's speech bewrayed him. Never did love of mankind clothe itself in such language. Could he have got the upper hand, he would simply have set the torch, in the spirit of reckless hatred, to a civilization which, with all its imperfections, is the most just to those who toil and the most hopeful that the world has seen.

— Some Americans appear to think that the struggle in Ireland is for national independence. It is true that the landlords are regarded by the peasantry as aliens, and historically, at all events, are so. But the struggle is essentially agrarian. Anyone who has watched the course of the Home Rule party must know that the political movement is very weak. Its feebleness and the uncertainty of its aim were betrayed when, for lack of such leaders as great national movements never fail to produce, it was fain to take up with so questionable an adventurer as the late Mr. Isaac Butt. Its special object, if it can be said to have one, is now completely merged in the agitation against rent. For our part, we have more than once avowed that if national independence were possible for Ireland, a patriotic struggle would command our sympathies. We thoroughly accept the Liberal principle of justice among nations: we do not

want to see communities bound together in bundles and deprived of their separate life to gratify anybody's vanity; we do not believe that Empire of this kind adds a particle to the happiness or to the real dignity even of the Imperial people. Of the two it is far worse and far meaner to be the conqueror and oppressor than to be the conquered and oppressed. But a struggle for independence, and independence itself, are possible only to a united nation. Ireland is very far indeed from being united. The Orange and Protestant North is at this moment ready to march against the Fenian and Catholic South; in the first hour of independence the two races and the two religions would be flying at each other's throats, and it is not unlikely, as experience shows, that the North, though the minority, might have the upper hand. At all events, if the Protestants of Ireland were hard pressed by the Catholics, nothing could prevent the Protestants of England and Scotland, especially those of Scotland, whose kinsmen as well as co-religionists the Irish Protestants are, from rushing to their aid. But of the Catholics themselves, particularly those of the wealthier class, many, since Catholic Emancipation and Disestablishment, have become unionists, while the clergy, and particularly the Hierarchy, are for the most part strongly opposed to Fenianism and to the project of an Irish Republic. Among the Home Rulers themselves, scarcely two are agreed in their political aims, and the peasantry, owing to their fatal want of constitutional training, are devoid of political ideas, and have no notion of anything but blindly following a chief whom they are apt to choose, as Americans know, on the most illusory grounds. There is not among the Irish leaders one capable of holding together any large body of his countrymen, much less is there one capable of founding an Irish commonwealth. If Ireland were cut loose from England to-morrow, in a month she would be a political bedlam, which would soon be turned into a slaughter-house. But as large a measure of self-government as most of the Home-Rulers themselves profess to desire may be attained in another way. The Liberal party

not only stands pledged to do justice to Ireland, but has been doing it for half a century, and in its last measures—the Land Bill which was carried ten years ago, and the Compensation Bill which was thrown out by the Tory House of Lords the other day—it has shown that its sense of right is not hidebound by conventional rules. Its victory over Jingoism in the last Election was the victory of righteousness over aggrandizement: under the same banner it still marches, and unless the Irish patriots distinctly see their way, not only to the political severance of their island from Great Britain, but to the peaceful establishment of an Irish Republic, wisdom bids them march on by its side.

It is natural that many should be found to arraign both the consistency and the wisdom of the Liberal Government in prosecuting Mr. Parnell and his fellows. If the prosecution were directed against opinion, the conduct of the Government would be most inconsistent and most unwise. But it is directed against public incitement to violence, outrage, and murder, which it is the duty of every Government to repress, and which, if they continue, will beget a righteous hatred of the cause for which they are committed, not only in England but over a great part of Ireland itself, and render the work of carrying remedial measures, in face of the Conservative resistance, even more desperately difficult than it is already. As we have said before, we are not even sure that the prosecutions will fail legally; still less are we sure that a proof given by the Government of resolution to uphold the law and handle law-breakers with determination will fail of the moral effect which was undoubtedly produced by the prosecution of O'Connell. No one who has not seen something of Irish administration can be aware to how great an extent the Ministry, on all these matters, is advised, and its course shaped by a standing staff of officials at Dublin, composed of men who know Ireland to the core, and are incomparably more capable than any outside critics, of estimating the public effect of any proposed measure in the minds of the people. There are some who ap-

parently would have had the Government do nothing, but allow the land question to be settled by the blunderbuss and the houghing-knife. There are others who would have had it suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, thereby depriving inoffensive citizens of their civil rights, filling the public mind with the sense of a reign of arbitrary force, and retarding the all-important process of training the Irish people in respect for law. There was more, in our judgment, to be said in favour of a renewal and application of the Arms Act. There is no measure of precaution which is so effectual and at the same time interferes so little with everybody's rights. Nobody can want arms except for a bad purpose, while the general possession of them by the peasantry is the sure incentive to lawless conspiracy and deeds of violence, even if it does not lead to bloodshed on a larger scale.

The Cabinet, while it vindicates the law, is framing remedial measures, and will very likely propose to Parliament something in the nature of an extension of the Ulster Tenant Right, which practically converts the landlords' interest into a regular rent-charge combined with a certain control over alienation. If we may trust our acquaintance with Ireland which perhaps is now somewhat out of date, we doubt whether in the Southern districts uncertainty of tenure is the principal root of the mischief or the cause of the present outbreak. We should rather have been disposed to trace the evil to the excessive and almost insane competition for farms which goes on among a people who have hardly any manufactures, not much commerce, nothing but the land to live on; and, in the thriftlessness which is the consequence of their unfortunate history, multiply beyond the means of subsistence. An Irish tenant, rather than give up his farm and be sent forth to starve, will undertake to pay a rent far beyond what the land will bear. Default, and if the matter is left to the bailiff, eviction follows. Among the essential facts of the case must be numbered, we fear, the excess of population in a country, of the land of which two-thirds are, from the wetness of the climate,

unfit for growing grain, especially in competition with the boundless harvests of America. Potato-growing is barbarism for nine years and in the tenth famine. Depletion of population there must be. But decisive experience seems to prove that freehold proprietorship, if it can be introduced, will bring an increase of prudence as well as of industry and thrift. Glebe land has been sold by the Church Commissioners to small proprietors, who paid for it in instalments, apparently with the best results. Perhaps with regard to other land a similar privilege of purchase by instalments at a Government valuation might be given to the tenant. Few landlords, probably, would refuse to part, on any equitable terms, with the privilege of rack-rent limited by assassination. The whole world will have reason to rejoice when the question has been settled: for a swarm of false land theories and schemes of agrarian rapine is rising from the soil of perturbed Ireland.

A people refusing to pay rent is a difficulty with which perhaps no Government has ever before had to grapple. It would present itself only in a country where the landowners were aliens and absentees. Political movements in Ireland have been put down with ease. They were sentimental and aggressive; but this is pecuniary and passive. The Fenian organization swarmed with informers: among every ten Fenians there was a Government spy; but in this agrarian agitation the people are evidently bound more closely together, and made more faithful to each other by an object which touches the pockets of them all. The difficulty of forecasting the result is increased by the impulsiveness and mobility of the Irish character, which are such that an incident comparatively trifling may give a new turn to the course of events. An increase of murder and outrage may awaken a spirit in England, Scotland, and the North of Ireland itself, which will call for decisive measures; and that the peasantry should make head in the field against the forces at the command of the Government is utterly out of the question. The leaders show their shallowness as well as their wickedness by encouraging outrage.

O'Connell was wise enough always to keep his agitation within the pale of law. The prosecutions are coming on, and it is not certain that a verdict of guilty will not be obtained from a Dublin jury which represents a commercial element by no means in sympathy with agrarian agitation. It does not seem that the excitement has taken much hold of the Irish people on this continent, for whom perhaps the agrarian has less interest than the political movement. Nor has insurrection in Ireland the slightest chance of aid from any European power. All the powers are standing in a deadlock of jealous hatred with their daggers at each other's throats, and not one of them would care to provide its enemy with a great maritime ally. Russia might have given trouble, but happily the quarrel with her is at an end.

There are rumours of dissensions in the Cabinet about the Irish question, and we may be sure that they are not unfounded. On such a subject, Whig landowners and Birmingham Radicals could not possibly be agreed. But dissension is not disruption: the personal ascendancy of the head of the Government is great; it was increased, as the most trustworthy critics tell us, by the events of the last Session, during which he showed himself completely master of the House of Commons; and by leaning to the side of the minority, as we cannot doubt he does, he will preserve the balance between the sections and prevent secession. Still, a division of the Radicals from the Whigs, and the formation of a mixed Government of Whigs and moderate Conservatives, with Lord Derby as its typical member, and perhaps as its head, is a probability of the near future. The time of the Radicals is not yet come: they have no leader, and as yet no plan.

—Election Commmissions in England have accounted for a certain portion of the Conservative reaction, notably for the great Conservative victory over Sir William Harcourt at Oxford. But this is the least part of the matter; the most important

part of it are the revelations of corruption, for which the ballot was supposed to be a cure. The fact is that though voting arrangements may throw obstacles in the way of corruption or facilitate its detection, nothing can uproot it where the tendency exists. Kill it in the form of bribery, it will re-appear in the form of "nursing," that is of a corrupt expenditure carried on by a wealthy candidate all the year round, and perfectly compatible with legal purity at the time of the election. Pauperism has been proved to be, to a great extent, hereditary: the same thing may be said, so far as England is concerned, of electoral corruption. Oxford, in the last century, was infamous even among the venal constituencies of that time: it scandalized a Parliament of borough-mongers by openly putting itself up for sale. It abounded in Freemen who were always specially corrupt, and have bequeathed the taint. Sandwich and others among the boroughs which have just been making themselves infamous, belong to the same class. The great constituencies which were created by the Reform Bill of 1832, such as Manchester and other Northern cities, are usually free from corruption: indeed, some of them are punctiliously pure, and will not allow the candidate to pay even his legal expenses, though they exact from him hard work. The immunity extends to those constituencies, county and metropolitan, in which the numbers baffle bribery. But here the expenses are sometimes enormous. Organization is very costly, and a large fee, generally one of $500, is expected by each of the local solicitors belonging to the party, in payment of his services as an election agent, or rather, because he is the only man who knows the people, has the key to their affairs, and can guide a candidate to their votes. We have known a candidate in a constituency of moderate size required to pay fourteen of these fees as the condition of his nomination.

The corrupt Oxford, be it observed, is the city not the University. The University, as a constituency, is so pure that the messenger who announces to a candidate his election is not even allowed to taste refreshment under the candidate's roof.

But the University has been disgraced by the conduct of some of her officers who have been so misguided as to take part in the electoral corruption of the city. The University bears the discredit; but she is not really to blame, any more than she and Cambridge are to blame for sending partisan nonentities as their representatives to Parliament, instead of sending examples of Academical training. She is the victim of political influences brought to bear on her from without. Both Peel and Gladstone received the votes of a decisive majority of the really Academical members of the Oxford constituency, especially of the honour men: they were thrown out by the country squires and parsons who, though non-resident, retain the suffrage as Masters of Arts, and come up, whenever party spirit is aroused, to vote for the Blue Ticket. The present offenders were thrust into their offices really by external influence, and, to do them justice, were intended to play pretty much the part which they have played. Neither from these scandals, therefore, nor from the obscurity of the representatives of Oxford and Cambridge in the House of Commons, can any argument be drawn against University representation. The real and conclusive argument against University representation is that it connects the Universities with party, from which, that they may do their proper work for the whole community, they ought to be absolutely free. Their duty is, if they can, to breed statesmen, not themselves to meddle with affairs of state.

—Female Suffrage, though rejected by the British House of Commons, has been adopted by the Isle of Man. As the Island is a diminutive appendage of the British Crown, without representation in the British Parliament, and has consequently no politics or diplomacy, a more harmless plaything than its suffrage cannot be imagined. Does anybody believe that the men of England or France or Germany would let the women vote them into a war? This is what the French women, if the

suffrage were given them, would try to do to-morrow; at the bidding of their priests they, like Eugenie, would vote for a war to break up Protestant Germany, or to recover the temporal dominions of the Pope: and there Female Government would end. It cannot be doubted that Lord Beaconsfield was wise after his generation in voting, as he always did, for women's suffrage in England: the female voters would have turned the scale in favour of his party, and the nation would be still pursuing a policy of military adventure in Afghanistan, supporting Ottoman tyranny, and trying to domineer over Europe at the perpetual risk of war. But would the men have submitted? Would not the agitation against a Government, known to be upheld in such courses by the votes of the women, have soon assumed a dangerous form? Suppose some great disaster had happened and the Ministers, compelled to go to the country, had appealed to their female supporters for protection in the ballot against the wrath of the men! Political authority has hitherto been vested by the right of necessity in the sex which alone can enforce the law at home and defend the country against attacks from abroad. Before it is transferred to a new foundation, it will be well to see that the new foundation is sound. It will be well also for women, before they exchange the guardianship of affection for the exercise of power, to assure themselves that the power will be real.

—The cession of Dulcigno was demanded in fulfilment of the Treaty of Berlin. This does not prevent the authors of the Treaty of Berlin from encouraging the Turk to kick against the cession of Dulcigno. The Turk, being encouraged, kicks, and the mutual jealousy of the Powers is so abject, that, at the time of our writing, he seems still to have a chance of making fools of them all. It matters little to anybody except to those "caterans," as Lord Salisbury graciously styles them, of Montenegro, who have been for so many centuries the heroic vanguard of Christendom. Except at a few points, where foreign

commerce makes a police for itself, the Ottoman Empire is now little better than a political chaos with plundering pashas floating on the top. Its army it may keep till the men die off, or the arsenals are exhausted; its steam fleet it cannot keep because engineers and skilled seamen will not serve without pay. The Ottoman race and Mahommetanism remain real forces, but they are being rapidly supplanted by the Greeks on the shores of the Ægean. The kingdom of Greece, though small, will form a nucleus, and at last a head, as Piedmont did for Italy. If diplomacy will keep her hands off, nature will do the work. Meantime, the disgrace of failure can hardly be said to rest specially on the only government which has honestly endeavoured to carry the Treaty into effect. We are told that Lord Beaconsfield would have done much better. What Lord Beaconsfield did, beyond all question, was by encouraging the Turk in resistance to justice to bring on the Russo-Turkish war, which it is now absolutely certain might have been averted by a policy of honesty and common sense. That England stands alone in her support of Greece is probably true: even Italy seems to have deserted a cause so similar and congenial to her own: but this isolation is not the most ignominious of positions; perhaps, if Greece succeeds, it may in the end prove not the weakest. Those who think that English diplomacy has failed because Vienna journals say so, must be warned against the influence of the "Yellow International," as the Germans call the Jews, which has got the Vienna press and some of the German newspapers into its hands, and to which Mr. Gladstone, as the liberator of the Christian communities, is an object of intense aversion.

Between the Eastern question, Afghanistan, and Ireland, the Liberals have inherited a goodly legacy from their opponents: as a party they would have fared better if they could have remained out of power two years longer; but their friends need not mourn for them so long as they keep the faith.

—In France another Ministerial crisis has come and gone: but some day a ministerial crisis may come and not go, at least not without carrying the Republic away in its train. A certain measure of dignity is necessary to every government, in no country more than in France: and what dignity can a government have which is tumbled over once in every six months, and the members of which are known to be the mere puppets of a preformer who sits behind the curtain pulling the strings? The wonder is that Gambetta can find any public men of decent standing to take this ignominious part. That he is playing his own game with skill cannot be doubted: but such craft is usually found in close alliance with selfishness, and we would rather see the Republic in less cunning hands. There is too much reason to fear also that Gambetta's mind is set on a war of revenge. The scenes in the Chamber to which people point as condemnatory of Republican institutions are not a whit more scandalous than those which took place in the Legislative Halls of the Restoration, out of which a member was once actually dragged by *gendarmes*, or even than some which, at moments of intense excitement, have disgraced both Houses of the British Parliament: and the chief culprits have been not republicans, but Imperialists and Monarchists, such as Cassagnac and D'Asson, who seem to act on the principle that a Republic is a blot on the political creation, and a monstrous birth of wickedness, towards which no laws of decency ought to be observed. It should always be remembered that the scenes are painted for us by the graphic pencil of the New York *Herald*.

—A fatal tendency to persecute opinion was inherited by the French Revolutionists from the despots and priests who had exterminated the French Protestants and murdered Calas. Nor has it yet been thoroughly worked off. The Liberals of other countries, therefore, have good reason for watching anything that looks like persecution on the part of their French breth-

ren with a jealous eye. But the expulsion of the Jesuits, whatever else it may be, is not persecution of opinion. The doctrines of Loyola are freely taught in France: the religion of Loyola is freely practised. Jesuitism is not a set of opinions, it is a conspiracy, carried on in the interest of a foreign power hostile to the independence of all nations. It has had its hand in a long succession of priestly crimes against humanity, from the religious wars and political assassinations of the sixteenth century down to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes down to the Swiss Sonderbund and the Franco-German war. Even its missionary enterprise, which is the better part of it, has been, to a great extent, as in Paraguay, subservient to its acquisition of power. What it was in the beginning, Jesuitism is now. Its ends and its means are the same. Its novices still commence their career by surrendering their consciences absolutely into the hands of their superior, divesting themselves of moral being, and becoming the "living corpses" which their founder enjoined them to be. Using education and the confessional as its engines, it carries on a war of intrigue, in conjunction with the other forces of reaction, against the existence of free institutions in France. Country it has none, nor regard for country. That it should sometimes be the object of exaggerated suspicion is only the natural consequence of its real acts and of the furtive character of its operations. Its suppression, in the interest of civil government, was extorted from the Papacy, not by Protestant or Rationalist Republics, but by the Catholic Monarchies of the last century. Cardinal Manning himself, the prince of Ultramontanes, does not want it in his domain. The simple question is whether its machinations were really dangerous to the Republic; if they were not, to expel it was a great mistake, if they were, there is no more to be said.

—A clearer case of persecution of opinion is Bismarck's attempt to silence Socialism in Germany. The result, as usual, has been the conversion of an erroneous theory into an explosive force. Pessimism, or Materialism, would, in like manner, become an explosive force if it were treated in the same way. Ruskinism might be made dangerous to the State by a sufficient number of gagging Acts. In the midst of the Labour War in the United States, the authorities allowed a Communistic meeting, with an extravagant programme, to be held at New York, only taking care that no breach of order was committed; and the result proved, in what might be deemed a crucial instance, the wisdom of keeping the safety-valve open. Bismarck is now trying homœopathy; he proposes to organize the whole of the working class, by compulsory legislation, into a vast guild or benefit society, after the mediæval fashion, but under the paternal authority of the State. The Middle Ages have passed away, and so, we venture to think, has the era of paternal government. Perhaps, in the case of Bismarck, we should rather say military than paternal, for military organization has been his forte and is his foible. By drill the great Chancellor united Germany, and saved her from French jealousy; by drill he thinks that German society is still to be guided and preserved. A system which makes every man a soldier has perhaps paved the way for arbitrary government, by impressing the people with habits of regimental obedience; but, on the other hand, the needle gun used on fields of national victory has imparted to the mass of the German people a sense of power such as was imparted to the English peasantry by the long bow drawn at Crecy and Poictiers, and with social results somewhat analogous to the great movement among the English villeins in the time of Richard II. German Socialism, however, unlike Wat Tyler and his followers, has, we believe, been guilty of no violence or conspiracy: it has submitted without resistance to the repressive laws Hödel, who attempted to assassinate the Emperor, seems clearly to have been an isolated maniac. The sting of Socialism is popular suffering, which, if

Bismarck can remove by reduction of armaments and general economy, he may safely leave Icarian projects and phalansteries to be dealt with by Economic Science, backed by the resistance which, in every community not utterly oppressed and miserable, proprietorship, industrial habit, and domestic affection, oppose to socialistic change.

—Who would have dreamed that the country which, for nearly a century, has led the van of European thought would be discussing the expediency of re-imposing political disabilities on the Jews? The movement, however, as was said before, is not religious, but economical and social. The idea of disabilities is absurd; such a reversal of progress would only make bad worse. An amendment of the naturalization law is alone feasible, and this would not meet the danger which the alarmists apprehend. If you cannot shut out Judaism altogether—and how is this to be done?—wisdom bids you bring to bear on it all the softening and domesticating influences in your power. But while we disapprove the line taken by the German people we can enter into their feelings. Their land, they say, is theirs: with the sweat of their brows they have made it fruitful; with their blood they have saved it from the spoiler. They now see it invaded by alien wanderers of an Oriental race, superior to its natives in astuteness, though inferior to them in industry, who come not so much to dwell in it as to feed on it, have no special affection for it or for its people, form a nation apart with an intensely exclusive sentiment, avoid as far as they can sharing public burdens, shun manual labour, take comparatively little part in productive industry, but suck up the wealth of the workers by usury and stockjobbing, insinuate themselves with patient craft into places of influence such as the offices of the press and seem likely to become, to a great extent, masters of a country, from which, if its riches failed or disaster overtook it, they would depart with as little compunction as they came. Such is the vision which presents

itself to the minds of the Germans, and has frightened them into this spasmodic effort of self-defence. That their alarm is at all events real, and that they are not feigning excuses for religious persecution, may be believed; for they are the most tolerant as well as the most good-natured of mankind. To rejoice in subjection to superior genius might be magnanimous, but from the days of the Egyptians downwards such magnanimity has been rare. Yes, let optimistic philosophy say what it will, there have been not only great calamities in history, but calamities the effects of which have endured, and are likely to endure. The dispersion of the Jews is one of them. Its evil effects were felt as keenly by the Roman world which knew not Christ as by the most fanatical communities of mediæval Christendom. We should have had a Greek dispersion also, and another train of the same evils, if Greece had not been given back to its own people. The restoration of Palestine to the Jews, which is now perfectly possible, might at all events be a partial remedy. Three thousand Jews are said to be on their way from Roumania, where they have incurred the bitter enmity of the people by their extortionate practices, to the United States. If Palestine were theirs, they would be on their way to Palestine. At New York they will ply the same trades which they ply in Houndsditch. On the hills of Judea they would be planting the olive and the vine.

—Let nothing but good be said of the dead is one of the maxims which are often much perverted in the application. Abstinence from censure is one thing; false praise is another. No doubt considerable license must be granted to adulation as well as to the other hypocrisies of funerals, and the orator who declared that he would tear a false inscription even from a tomb, if he had undertaken literally to fulfil his threat, would have had a hard day's work before him. Tony Foster, the undoubted murderer of Amy Robsart, lies in Cumnor Church be-

neath a sumptuous monument, inscribed with a prolix rehearsal of his extraordinary virtues which indignation has never attempted to deface. Still there are limits even to obituary lying, and it is particularly offensive when religion is used to trick out the panegyric of a scoundrel, and we are told as a finishing touch that the deep source of all his virtues was his piety. It may be that this extravagance is sometimes a rebound from previous injustice; weak minds are always slopping over on both sides. What is most mischievous of all, however, is not the mere misdescription of an individual character, but the wresting of general principles to suit the exigencies of an awkward case. We chanced the other day to take up an obituary notice in which, evidently for the personal behoof of the deceased, was introduced a general defence of miserly habits. If miserly habits are good, generosity, beneficence, and hospitality are evil. The miser is not so mischievous to society as the licentious spendthrift who debauches as well as wastes; yet it is very wretched and ignoble to be a miser. A man who is a miser is a living advertisement of the omnipotence of gold.

> "Dear saint,
> Riches, the dumb god that giv'st all men tongues,
> That can'st do nought and yet mak'st men do all things;
> The price of souls; even hell, with thee to boot,
> Is made worth heaven. Thou art virtue, fame,
> Honour, and all things else. Who can get thee,
> He shall be noble, valiant, honest, wise."

These lines contain in fact the explanation of the vice. The miser feels that he is accumulating the means of boundless enjoyment, dignity and influence, though he never applies the means to the end, and he goes on till the end is lost in the means. Often the infirmity becomes sheer lunacy, and the man's last years are spent in insane dread of poverty: we have heard of a millionaire who, in his old age, was possessed with the belief that he was a pauper, and could be quieted only by pretending to pay him a weekly allowance, which he fancied kept him from the poor-house. Political economists are in-

clined to look with favour on misers because they store up capital. But though economists are not flinty, their science, pursued without correctives, is apt to become so: we know one, a very kind-hearted man, who used to say that in the Day of Judgment, though his record might in some respects be weak, he would be able with truth to plead, as an atonement for his other sins, that he had never given a penny to a beggar. After all capital is made for humanity, not humanity for capital; and he who, by his example, teaches us to harden our hearts makes poor amends by adding, in a very roundabout way, to the contents of our pockets. A rich man, if his tastes are simple, as those of most men of noble nature are, is not bound to spend money in keeping up a grand establishment, nor is he bound to head all the subscription-lists, if there are good objects of his own selection on which he prefers to concentrate the wealth at his command. We praise the Italian banker who hoarded for many years that, by one splendid act of munificence, he might pay off the city debt. But no economist will succeed in persuading us that a man ought not to make the best use he can of his money while he lives, and, above all, to keep his heart above his gold. A rich man's house which never welcomes a guest, even at Christmas, from which the hand of charity has never been stretched forth, on which the eye of gratitude is never turned from the throng, will always be the monument of a grand mistake. Often the scene closes amidst the plottings, caballings and heart-burnings of expectant harpies, whose wrangling voices are the miser's requiem instead of the public blessing which, had he been wiser, he might have earned.

—Hanlan has kept himself clear of the tricks and rogueries of his trade, and for having done so, he personally deserves applause, though to applaud him for common honesty is to pass the severest censure on the trade. Nor have we forgotten his generous and graceful act in subscribing a hundred dollars to the

amateur boat-races. But his career has had the disastrous effect of awakening among us the accursed passion for gambling, at once on the largest scale and in the most dangerous form. Only the disreputable will sit down to the dice: but respectable men will bet and even encourage their children in betting. If, on such an occasion as this race, a patriotic feeling is mingled with the love of gambling, so much the worse: the vice by being dignified is made more seductive. Once inoculated, society will be long in working off the disease. It is understood that a sum not short of a hundred thousand dollars was transmitted from Toronto to London, to be staked upon this race. Much of this money was risked by young men who could ill have afforded to lose it, and some of whom, had they lost it, might have then been tempted to recover it by dishonesty. We hear of poor people staking all their savings. Those who bet on Hanlan have won, but those who bet against him have lost: the winners of to-day will spend lightly, and to-morrow they will be the losers. A frank expression of opinion on this subject will not be resented by any one who has seen how utterly gambling drags down and shatters a young man. Napoleon who, though wicked himself, wanted to be served by trustworthy men, and was a very shrewd judge of character, always avoided those whom he believed to be addicted to gambling, saying that no confidence could ever be placed in them. Managers and employers will find that Napoleon was in the right. A secondary evil is the setting up of an utterly false standard of merit. We use the term merit in the most liberal sense, as including every exhibition of qualities that are or may be of any real use to the community. No such qualities are exhibited by shell-rowing, which, though a healthy amusement for amateurs, is otherwise of no more use, directly or indirectly, than any other sport or game. The calling of the wherryman, with which these rowing matches were once connected, is as obsolete as that of the running footman or the thatcher. The steamboat is now "First oars." Besides, wherrymen rowed in boats capable of carrying passengers, not

in shells which would be sunk by a ripple. So far as usefulness, or everything that can possibly conduce to it, is concerned, a poor Esquimaux, navigating in his little skiff the dangerous waters of the Hudson Bay, is worth a whole population of shell-rowers. A professional sporting man begins by deserting useful and honest trades, on which his career is a practical slur; and an industrial community which pays him public homage does its utmost to degrade and discourage the pursuits and qualities by which it lives. Intelligence can hardly be displayed, in any high degree, by the mere repetition of a uniform and almost mechanical motion. We have even known successful scullers who were far from being remarkably fine or healthy specimens of humanity. Yet a man who had performed the most splendid feat of seamanship on our lakes, who as an explorer had opened to us, by his enterprise and fortitude, some new and valuable territory, who had saved a fellow citizen's life at the risk of his own, would not receive a thousandth part of the homage which is lavished on a professional sculler. We may hope that the chief seat of the frenzy is Toronto, and that of the money sent to the English betting ring, not much belonged to farmers. There is, of course, no use in preaching against a mania. Nothing avails but an antidote, such as is provided by those rowing clubs which do their best to preserve the healthy character of the amusement, and to exclude the professional sporting man with the roguery, vice, and misery which he invariably brings in his train.

—Among the many symptoms of Ecclesiastical disintegration we note that the *Canada Presbyterian* has fallen out with the *Globe* over the reception of Sara Bernhardt. The *Globe* compiles column after column of gushing panegyrics. The *Canada Presbyterian* calls this sort of thing "an agony of baseness," characteristic of "simpering imbecility which would fain be thought cultured," and, striking an attitude of martyr resignation to the endurance of calumny, defies the *Globe* to throw at its head

the epithets "fanatic" and "mawworm." The *Globe* might reply by reminding its offended sister that Sara has received the public homage of the Prince and the Princess of Wales. As the expression of its own sentiments, the *Canada Presbyterian* gives an extract from the letter of a reverend gentleman, who calls this adorable woman not only "dirty, impudent and offensive," but a name which a lay journalist cannot venture to repeat. A lay journalist, however, will hardly go beyond the mark in saying, that the enthusiasm which greets Sara Bernhardt, not only on the stage but off it, is a phenomenon characteristic of the age, and one which affords matter for reflection. Americans can never help flinging themselves at the feet of celebrity, especially when it comes to them accredited by European opinion, which, and English opinion above all, they regard with excessive deference. So far as they are concerned, their raptures about Sara Bernhardt and their wild competition for tickets to see her, are notoriety-worship and nothing more. But the homage paid her in England by the cynosures of society, no doubt, denotes a change of sentiment. The science of ethics is in a state of transition. Calling Sara's peculiarities "French" is an unjust reflection on the French character: nowhere is domestic affection stronger, nowhere are its manifestations in family life more beautiful than among the French people generally, and especially in the rural districts. But there is a circle, principally in Paris, of which the sentiment is that embodied in a number of well-known works of fiction. To this circle, Sara Bernhardt, if current biography speaks the truth about her, would appear to belong, and to its account her errors may be charged more justly than to her own. For our part, we do not want to pry into any one's private life, or to set up a standard of which, in matters perhaps not less important than sexual regularity, we may ourselves fall miserably short. In the Old World it is possible that the enthusiasm for culture or dramatic art may, in the case of a magnificent actress, overpower all other thoughts and save the devotee from harm. In communities like ours, this can hardly be the case, and, as regular

union of the sexes seems to us the keystone of morality and happiness, if Sara Bernhardt preaches disrespect for it by her example, we cannot pretend to receive with sorrow the announcement that she is not coming to Toronto.

—It is curious to note the backstreams which always run against a great current of opinion. Against the great current of Scepticism is now running a backstream of ecclesiastical apparition and miracle. While the existence of a Deity is questioned in the Conservative press of highly educated countries, the Virgin appears at Knock, in Ireland, and an old woman is cured of her rheumatism by a piece of cement sent her by a priest from the favoured Church. Of course the vision was seen, and the cure was really experienced. Some thirty years ago there were in the Tyrol two women called the Estatica and the Addolorata, one of whom had the signs of the Passion marvellously impressed upon her body, while the other was lifted up off the ground in the ecstacy of prayer. The cases turned out as usual to be mixtures of hysteria and imposture; and the exhibitions, if we recollect right, were finally suppressed by the Catholic authorities themselves. Yet we ourselves heard a man of intellect and education, whose testimony in any ordinary case would have been first rate, declare that he, in company with two other persons equally credible, had actually witnessed the miracles. The Holy Coat of Treves was as spurious as the House of Loretto: it was not woven, as that of Christ is stated to have been; antiquarians conjectured that it was the coat of a soldier of the Varangian guard. Yet it performed temporary cures in rheumatic and nervous cases: to give a man who had lost a leg or arm a new limb was beyond its power. Vision and miracle have not ventured to display themselves much on this side of the Atlantic: instead of choosing countries in which their influence might be useful in combating scepticism, they unaccountably waste themselves on those in which nobody needs to be converted.

Even ordinary apparitions seem to be having their day again, though the fact is that every one of us, however sceptical, has always cherished one ghost story. As in the case of the ecclesiastical apparition, the phantom is really seen. "Believe in ghosts!" said Coleridge, "No, Madam, I have seen too many of them." We had once the curiosity to look through the principal ghost stories in order to learn on what evidence they had been believed. The only one that would have stood its ground at all under cross-examination by Mr. Blake was that of the wicked Lord Lyttelton. It was perfectly well attested that Lord Lyttelton had recounted to his friends a supernatural communication which he pretended to have received, warning him that he would die at a certain hour; and that, at that hour, his valet, entering his bedroom, found him dying on the floor. But the explanation is easy: the voluptuary sated with his vicious life had resolved to commit suicide, and the warning apparition was a trick devised by him to mask the nature of his death. It was not very likely that the laws of nature would be suspended to announce the approaching exit of a debauchee. No less a personage than the historian Clarendon has a ghost story which he tells with pomp and is evidently disposed to believe. It relates to a supernatural warning supposed to have been conveyed to the Duke of Buckingham on the eve of his assassination by Felton, and by the Duke to have been communicated to his mother. But on inspection we find that Clarendon himself vouches for no part of the evidence except the fact that the old Duchess appeared less surprised and moved than might have been expected on receiving the news of her son's murder. More than one account of her comparative apathy might be suggested; and here again we may observe that Heaven was not likely to attach quite so much weight to the concerns of the Duke of Buckingham as was attached to them by Lord Clarendon. We have said that everybody cherishes one ghost story. Our's is that of the children who, scampering along a dark passage at the end of which they would have fallen into a well, were stopped by the ghost of their mother.

Ghost-lore may be left to grandmammas. A far more serious affair is Spiritualism, which appears to have a strong hold on many weak, a few strong, and one or two scientific minds. Spiritualism in one aspect may be numbered with reactions against Materialism, though in another aspect it is the grossest of Materialism itself, for what can be more materialistic than table-turning and planchette? It was in the form of table-turning, be it always remembered, that Spiritualism first appeared, and in this case the character of the ultimate development is determined by that of the germ. Table-turning seems to have been first started as a joke: when it became an illusion and a mania, it was conclusively resolved by Professor Owen's experiment into a nervous motion of the hands of the performers. The belief that the spirit world communicates with us through the legs of tables, or even through a planchette, may be safely pronounced lower than the lowest superstition of the savage, and to surrender our minds to it is to do the utmost despite to what is spiritual in ourselves. It might have been supposed that the farcical exposures of Katie King, and of a score of similar impostors, would have been enough to put an end to the epidemic; yet it still widely prevails. Each great eclipse of religious belief in history has been attended by some nemesis of this kind. Sceptical Rome had her Egyptian charlatans, the prototypes of the Sludges, her mysteries of Isis and Serapis, her thaumaturgists, her astrologers. Astrology reigned again in that religious void which followed the decline of the Catholic faith of the Middle Ages, nor, wonderful to say, has it yet ceased to have votaries; not many years ago, at least, it had some amongst the educated classes in London, and maintained a periodical of its own. Mr. Home and his compeers are charlatans of impressive demeanour, who have thoroughly studied the art of fascinating the mind: through the mind they bewitch the senses: and having bewitched the senses they are able to perform very mean and common conjuring tricks without being detected. They are allowed, without demurrer, to arrange conditions for the practice of their legerdemain, to which ex-

ception would at once be taken in the case of an ordinary conjuror; to darken the room and place the spectators so as to preclude close inspection. Under an imperfect light, the professor of Spiritualism orders a heavy arm-chair to leave its place against the wall and to come to him in the middle of the room. The arm-chair obeys. The spectators, fascinated beforehand by the professor's mental art, stand, where he has placed them, all agape, and awestruck at his miraculous power. If he were a common conjuror they would bid him cause the chair to move away from him as well as towards him, or place themselves between him and the chair as it moved; they would then perhaps become aware that he was pulling the chair to him with a horse-hair line. Curiosity once led us to visit a medium, whom a spiritualistic friend recommended as the very first of the class. Never was money better spent than the fee which we paid for the interview. To call the imposture gross and palpable is to do it less than justice; it was absolutely childish: and when we witnessed it, knowing that it had duped, and was still duping, thousands, the depth of human credulity was revealed. The female spirit who entered into the medium, as the charlatan avowed, groped her way evidently by the light of a few facts gleamed from a preliminary conversation between the sitter and the medium: she stumbled from blunder to blunder and gave accounts of what had never existed. In the United States there was a famous female medium, who kept a hotel and drew guests by her spiritualist performances. She sat in a sort of box, with one opening on a level with her head, and another on a level with her knee; through the upper opening, when the spectators had been wound up by singing and other devices to illusion point, the spirits of the adult dead showed their faces; through the lower, those of the infant dead, who, it seems, retained in the other world the disability of stature. The adult dead were, no doubt, personated by a mask on the medium's face, the infant dead by a mask on her knee. The presence among the spectators of a professor of science caused the spirits to decline performing for that day. A pas-

sionate desire to hold communion with lost objects of love is the only element in addiction to Spiritualism which merits our respect and sympathy, and this is but a small set-off against the tendency of the practice to debase the intellect of those who indulge in it, to lay them open to the inroads of imposture from all quarters, and to pervert their conceptions of the spirit world. We have recently had a most lamentable case of suicide of which the mental disturbance produced by Spiritualism appears to have been the cause.

—To class Ritualism with Spiritualism would be uncivil: but as an avowed attempt to take the world back to the faith and worship of the Middle Ages, it is the most pronounced of back-streams. It has been brought prominently before Canadians of late by the visits of its eminent preachers, Mr. Mackonochie and Mr. Knox-Little, as well as before the world in general, by the grotesque collision of the contumacious Mr. Dale, on the subject of candles and vestments, with the laws of the Church, on whose authority the whole system professes to be based. If the Ritualists undertake to prove, by reason or by Scripture, that the Episcopate, as the depository of Church authority, is infallible, or at least entitled to a mental submission without bounds; that to priests are committed the keys of spiritual life and death; that the sacramental theory of religion is the right one; that gorgeous robes, incense, bells, banners, and genuflexions are essential to worship; these propositions, like any others advanced by sincere and zealous men, are entitled to our respectful consideration. But if they found their claims on the immemorial tradition of the Church of England, and call upon us not to reason with them, but to bow to that authority, we must say of their immemorial tradition, as Edie Ochiltree said of Monkbarn's Prætorium, "We mind the bigging on't." It is less than half a century old. It was born with the clerical reaction against the Liberal movement which carried the Reform Bill of 1832, and threatened to dissolve the union of Church and State. Ritualism is the continuation of Tractarian-

ism, though in a more feminine form; and the source of Tractarianism can be pointed out, as distinctly as that of any river, in a passage of the first of the *Tracts for the Times*. "Now, then," says the writer of that Tract, "let me come at once to the subject which leads me to address you. Should the Government of the country so far forget their God as to cut off the Church, to deprive it of its temporal honours and substance, *on what* will you rest the claims to respect and attention which you make upon your flocks? Hitherto you have been upheld by your birth, your education, your wealth, your connection; should these secular advantages cease, on what must Christ's ministers depend? Is not this a serious practical question? We know how miserable is the state of religious bodies not supported by the State. Look at the Dissenters on all sides of you, and you will see at once that their ministers, depending simply upon the people, become the *creatures* of the people. Are you content that this should be your case? Alas, can a greater evil befall Christians, than for their teachers to be guided by them instead of guiding." "On what then," the writer proceeds to ask, "are we (the clergy) to rest our authority when the State deserts us?" The answer is given in these words—"There are some who rest their divine mission on their own unsupported assertion; others who rest it upon their popularity; others on their success; and others who rest it upon their temporal distinction. This last case has been perhaps too much our own; I fear we have neglected the true ground on which our authority is built—our Apostolic Descent." Whoever believes in the "Apostolic Descent" of the clergy, will soon believe in the priestly system. Gradual, half-conscious, and furtive approaches were soon made by the Tractarians to Roman Catholicism, under cover of disclaimers, which lent a somewhat Jesuitical character to the movement, though the conscientiousness of the leaders was beyond doubt. At last Mr. Ward, the most logical mind and the *enfant terrible* of the party, joyously proclaimed that numbers of English clergymen were embracing the whole cycle of Roman doctrine. This brought matters to a head.

Mr. Ward's book was condemned by the clerical University of Oxford, which, before the revival of Convocation, served as the mouthpiece of the Church; and the Tractarian leaders soon saw what every one who uses his reason must see, that there was no standing-place for Roman doctrine outside Rome. Newman and his friends accordingly went to the Church to which their principles belonged. Anybody who denies that before the appearance of Tractarianism the Church of England was Protestant, in name and fact, must be prepared to wipe out the ecclesiastical history of England. Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley would have been incredible fools had they suffered martyrdom for the difference between Ritualism and Rome. The King, who is the head of the Church, pledges himself by his coronation oath "to maintain the Protestant reformed religion established by the law." Everyone who is old enough to remember the events of 1840-45, can attest that the Ritualist doctrines and practices, when first brought under the notice of the Church by the Tractarian movement, were received with surprise and horror by the mass, not only of the laity, but of the clergy, and by almost all the Bishops. A curious example of infallible authority this Church who did not know of what spirit she was till a group of young Oxford clergymen arose to tell her, and who, when her real doctrines and her proper form of worship were presented for her approval, not only failed to recognise them, but repelled them with disgust!

It was natural that Oxford should be the centre of the movement; her character and studies were intensely clerical; her buildings and associations were mediæval; so were the statutes of her colleges, and they bound the Fellows to celibacy, making them in fact half monks. The marriage of the clergy, combined with the dependance of their families on their preferment, has been and is the great practical check on their progress towards Rome. Of the two leaders who did not go over with Newman, Keble was married and held a living, Pusey had been married, had children, and was a dignitary of the Established Church, besides being noted for intellectual pe-

culiarities which enabled him to stop short of logical conclusions. Newman was a celibate Fellow of a college; so were Froude, Morris, Oakley, Faber, and Ward. Dr. Pusey furnished a good deal of the learning, but Henry Newman, now the Cardinal, furnished the genius of the party. A singular, as well as illustrious, pair of brothers are Henry and Francis Newman. The object of pursuit with Francis has always been the truth, and the chase has led him through a series of "phases of faith" as his spiritual autobiography calls them, which may vie with the wanderings of any ecclesiastical Ulysses. With the Cardinal the object of pursuit has always been the best system, and his acute and fertile intellect has been employed in devising arguments, some of them curious enough, to bring the best system into tolerable harmony with reason. We owe gratitude to him as one who has tried for us a great experiment in spiritual living; but for truth, as truth, let no one look to his pages. He will give you a list of miracles and relics that would severely try the credulity of a Calabrian peasant; he will trace the growth of the myth of the Virgin, so that any intelligent boy must see its legendary character; then by an effort of faith he will protest that he believes it all. Francis is the driest of "dry light." Henry is all poetry, and the picture of the mediæval Church, created by his loving fancy, and set forth in his charming style, took by storm the hearts of the Oxford students of that day, who had known nothing more attractive in the way of religion than Evangelicalism, then declining, or the sawdust Establishmentarianism, aptly nicknamed "High and Dry." The talisman of his personal influence was also extremely potent, and whether he was conscious of it or not, he used it to the utmost of its power. In this respect, as in others, his *Apologia*, like autobiographies in general, is a self-deception. Those who want a glimpse into the real man, as he was in those days, will find it in *Loss and Gain*, a religious tale written by him at the time of his secession. Few young men of promise at Oxford escaped the spell; not very many remained Tractarians, but all were

cut adrift from their old moorings; and they drifted, some of them as wrecks, to every shore of belief or unbelief. Many expected that Henry, like Francis Newman, would continue his wanderings and again pass out of the Church of Rome; but they did not ask themselves whither he could go. His originality was disquieting to the safe and regular stagers like Cardinal Wiseman; his characteristic treatment of Papal Infallibility, not questioning it, but deftly paring it down to nonentity, must have been anything but satisfactory to the Society of Jesus; under Pius he was evidently labelled dangerous though valuable, and his promotion to the Cardinalate shows that a new policy has come with Leo.

Tractarianism under Newman was a far more serious thing than this aftergrowth of Ritualism, which, as its name imports, appeals largely to a love of ecclesiastical pageantry, evidently akin to the prevailing sensationalism of the day. Newman never went much into the candle and vestment part of the business, and though his religious philosophy placed ecclesiasticism above reason, he remained a religious philosopher, and never sank into an obscurantist. From his writing to the highest writing of the Ritualists, the descent is great. He lowered and could not help lowering himself by his desperate efforts to hold an untenable position within the pale of a Protestant Church and to twist its formularies into accordance with the doctrines in opposition to which they had been framed. But of this humiliation in his case there was an end. If he lingered, he never paltered. As soon as he clearly saw the step to which his convictions led, he took it, and entitled himself thereby to universal respect and gratitude.

On what Ritualism stands, intellectually, it would be hard to say. If Church authority is the foundation, and if the organs of that authority are the Bishops, surely what is said by the immense majority of the Bishops is likely to be right. But the immense majority of the Bishops pronounce Anglican doctrine to be heresy, and the Church of England to be no Church at all. The genuineness of the Roman Catholic Episcopate the

Ritualists do not question. They seem to cherish a belief that they are in passive or suspended communion with Rome. The first Roman Catholic priest they meet will dispel the illusion, and tell them that their Bishops are lay heretics, that their Orders and Sacraments are figments, and that they can obtain admission to the true Church only by abjuration, penance, and conditional rebaptism. Surely he who believes that salvation is to be found only under the authority of a visible and universal Church, if he has regard for Bishop Butler's principles of probability, will betake himself to the only visible Church which can pretend to be universal. The Ritualists, feeling their weakness, turn to the Greek Church, and try to form an alliance with it, though they consign its members to everlasting perdition, each time the Athanasian Creed is repeated, for denying the procession of the Third from the Second Person of the Trinity. The same attempt was made in the last century, in concert with some divines of the Gallican Church, headed by Ellies Dupin; but it came to nothing. The Greek, or as it may be more truly called, the Russian, Church is intensely national; it does not care to proselytize, nor does it wish to connect itself with foreign Churches. The late Mr. William Palmer, one of the most eminent of the Tractarians, spent many years in trying to bring the Russian and the Anglican Churches into communion with each other, but in vain. Mr. Mackonochie's theory is, that the Anglican Church is the Church of the English-speaking race; the fact, both actual and historical, is far otherwise: but supposing it were not so, what has the accident of language to do with religious truth? The real foundation of Ritualism is the private judgment of its leaders, who at their discretion modify the doctrine and worship and regulate the advance towards Rome, though by speaking of themselves always in the third person feminine they keep up the impression that their voice is that of the Church. A perpetual stream of secessions, especially among the clergy and the aristocracy, attests the weakness of the position. The strength of Ritualism lies on its sentimental and æsthetic side; perhaps, also, in its

sisterhoods, which appear to gratify a strong inclination if not to meet a real need of women, and to deserve the respectful attention even of those who dislike the sectarian objects to which in Ritualistic hands the system is applied. The movement has an obvious attraction for the clergy, irrespectively of any selfish ambition, as leading to the recovery of an authority over the laity which they are persuaded they will use for good. Nor is this source of its strength likely to decrease. As intellect is deterred from entering the clerical profession, in these days of perplexity, by dislike of tests, means of influence other than intellectual, such as the command of the sacraments, the power of absolution, and the fascination of dress and ceremonial, will become more necessary and will be more cultivated than ever.

It is impossible for those who hold that a natural basis is necessary to sustain religious belief, and that Ritualism has none, to suppose that the system will be long-lived. It will be strange if ever-recurring conflicts with the laws and authorities of the Establishment do not lead in England to a secession on such a scale as would, at all events, terminate the history of the movement within the Anglican Church. In that case the Ritualists would probably, after lingering for a time in some intermediate state, find their way at last to Rome. It is not impossible that the catastrophe may be hastened by an imbroglio arising out of the use of an unregulated confessional. The Church of Rome, fully aware of the dangers which beset the exercise of this tremendous engine of spiritual and social power, has so regulated it as to make it almost mechanical, while her clergy are as far as possible unsexed. The theory of the Ritualists is that the Church of England authorizes the confessional; but the fact is that she neither does, nor has done anything of the kind; consequently there are no regulations or safeguards, and a clergyman not unsexed assumes the function of a spiritual director with no law to guide or restrain him but his own discretion. The revelations elicited a short time ago by Lord Redesdale, and comprised in a pamphlet which, on grounds of delicacy, was circulated only among members of Parliament,

showed that in no respect, but in being unauthorized and uncontrolled, did the Ritualistic system differ from that of the Roman Catholics. In England mutterings of domestic suspicion and remonstrance have been already heard, and the first loud outcry will probably bring on a crash.

—Moral Philosophy seems to have reached the bottom of the descent: perhaps she may now begin to struggle upwards. Mr. Spencer's Data of Ethics has found a critic from the Agnostic point of view in the person of Dr. Van Buren Denslow, whose work on *Modern Thinkers* appears with a preface by Col. Ingersoll, and who appears to be a vigorous thinker in his way, though a rough writer. Dr. Denslow is of opinion that Mr. Spencer has stopped short of his legitimate conclusion, and that he ought to have discarded the idea of morality altogether. Moral laws, according to Dr. Denslow, "can be shown by analysis and historical research to be merely doctrines established by the strong for the government of the weak." "It is the strong who require the weak to tell the truth, and always to promote some interest of the strong." "Thou shalt not steal, is a moral precept invented by the strong, the matured, the successful, and by them impressed upon the weak, the infantile and the failures in life's struggle, as all criminals are." "So the laws forbidding unchastity were penned by those who in the earlier periods of civilization, could afford to own women, for the protection of their property rights in them against the poor who could not," It is the same with the other precepts of morality, including, we presume, that which forbids murder. In place of ethics Dr. Denslow would have, as the rule of human conduct, and of any system that is framed to regulate it, an analytical account of the passions or propensities which demand gratification after the manner of the phrenologists or Fourier. We confess that if we stood on the ground on which Mr. Spencer stands, we should find it difficult to prevent ourselves from being pushed by the stalwart arm of Dr. Denslow's logic into the gulf of

Ethical Nihilism. Looking at the subject from Mr. Spencer's point of view, we fail to see why one human tendency is to be deemed higher than another, or the set of men in whom a particular tendency prevails to be called better than those who obey its opposite. Superior strength is the only ground of preference which to us is distinctly visible. That morality is the law imposed by the strong upon the weak,—the law of the "upper dog," to use Dr. Denslow's homely phrase, is a doctrine by no means new. It was preached with equal plainness by the Sophists amidst the general dissolution of public morals which attended the frenzied strife of faction in Greece at the time of the Peloponnesian war, and was met by Socrates and Plato with a moral idealism founded on belief in a Deity. It is a little startling to find at the end of Dr. Denslow's volume an essay in which he vehemently and almost fiercely defends large fortunes and their possessors against what he supposes to be the communistic teachings of the Gospel. He charges the founder of Christianity with leaving us only "a weak basis on which to resist the class of *crimes* which, like forgery, robbery, larceny and burglary, and certain phases of social vice, take from the rich to give to the poor." The phrase which we have marked with italics seems scarcely consistent with the theory that moral law is merely the law of the upper dog. Dr. Denslow is particularly offended by the saying about the Lilies of the Field, which he denounces as scientifically false, inasmuch as botanists know that lilies do spin, and economically vicious, because it incites to idleness and beggary. We venture to think that we could prove to him that the Gospel rightly read enjoins not idleness, but honest industry, which, combined with general morality, is sure to produce wealth; though the Bible bids you when riches increase not to set your heart upon them, a precept which some of the greatest captains of industry have obeyed without any sort of detriment to their efficiency as servants of civilization. A begging friar can hardly plead the example of Paul, who, while he was preaching the Gospel, maintained himself by the labour of his own hands.

As to the Founder of Christianity, though he did not labour with his hands he was not idle, even if we leave theology out of view—his work is Christian civilization. It must be owned, however, that Atheistic Plutocracy is not the Christian ideal. There will be a grand battle some day between the Scientists of the School of Proudhon and those of the School of Colonel Ingersoll and Dr. Denslow.

—Greek and Latin are called dead languages and coupled in Mr. Bright's epigram with undying prejudices, which, however, they did not foster in the breasts of the great men of the Renaissance or the English Commonwealth. But we are not so sure that they are dead: in the struggle of languages for existence they may yet have a part to play. Modern Greek as a literary language has now been brought back nearly to the ancient form, and it will soon be the tongue of a revived Greek nation. It is, without question, the finest instrument of human thought, and is admitted so to be by Science, who borrows from it the immense majority of her terms. Latin, though it has ceased to be the international language of Europe, has hardly ceased to be the academical language, and it is still the religious language of the largest of Christian churches. As an international language, it would have advantages over the French, not only on account of its superior strength and terseness, but because it is neutral, and does not disseminate the special ideas and sentiments of any one nation. We watch, therefore, with an interest not exclusively connected with classical antiquity, anything that concerns the study of Greek or Latin. Professor Tracy Peck, who has just been transferred from Cornell University to Yale, to the great loss of the former and gain of the latter, announces his intention, it seems, of introducing what he calls the Roman pronunciation of Latin. Fully appreciating Professor Peck's scholarship, we doubt his power of telling us how Latin was pronounced by the Romans. Who will undertake to tell us how English was pronounced by Chaucer?

The history of the editions of that poet shows how much uncertainty there is upon that point. Yet, from Chaucer's time to ours, the general structure of the language has remained unchanged; there has been an unbroken succession of writers; nor has the English race been alloyed, or its vocal organs modified, by any large admixture of alien elements from abroad. It is needless to say how entirely these conditions are reversed in the case of Rome, or how vast a chasm, ethnographical, literary and linguistic, divides modern Italy and the other Romance countries from the Rome whose language Professor Peck undertakes to reproduce. It is a thousand to one that to the ear of Cicero or Virgil the Professor's "Roman" would appear an unearthly brogue. Our present mode of pronouncing Latin, as well as our mode of pronouncing Greek, is simply a confession that the ancient pronunciation is lost. If it is proposed, on the ground of international convenience, to adopt a common pronunciation, well and good; and we have nothing to say against the selection of the Italian pronunciation for the purpose. But the revival of Roman pronunciation we believe to be a chimera. Great inconvenience would be caused to scholars by rendering them unintelligible to each other, just as great inconvenience is caused by the fidgetty fancies about ancient orthography, which are setting half the volumes in our classical libraries by the ears with the other half, without adding a particle to our power of appreciating the classics. The Roman pronunciation was the only thing wanting to the banquet given after the manner of the ancients in "Peregrine Pickle." The sow's stomach, filled with a composition of minced pork, hog's brains, eggs, pepper, cloves, garlic, aniseed, rue, ginger, oil, wine, and pickle, which produced such dire effects upon the guests at that memorable entertainment, was probably as accurate a reproduction of the dainties which graced the board of Vitellius, as *wany, weedy, weechy* is of the proud utterance of the first Cæsar.

This book should be returned to the Library on or before the last date stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred by retaining it beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.

JUL 20 1931

JUN 26 56 H

Widener Library
3 2044 100 136 332